LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

★

Labour's Nuclear Policy

is discussed by W. Wainwright

★

What's this about Berlin?

D. N. Pritt, Q.C. gives the answer

★

AFTER PARIS–WHAT NEXT? by R.P.D.

Shirley Graham on U.S. SIT-DOWN

PENTAGON WRECKERS by Quaestor

W. J. Michael (Blacksmiths) on AMALGAMATION

JULY · 1960

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A POLICE ROW

SEVENTY YEARS ago this month there was a strike amongst the Metropolitan Police. Unlike the police strikes of 1918 and 1919, which get a mention in the history books and adult education syllabuses, this strike of 1890, with the scenes at Bow Street in Covent Garden pictured on pages 312-3, is quite passed over. But in the pages of *Commonweal*, organ of the Socialist League, the story is told of how in 1890 discontent was growing in the Metropolitan Police Force over pay, hours and pensions. A new factor was that police duties had included chivying socialist propagandists as well as dockers and gasworkers on strike. Many 'in the course of their duty' had been listening to speeches from such people as John Burns, Tom Mann, Ben Tillett, William Morris, Bernard Shaw and Eleanor Marx. Discontent was first concentrated on police pension rights. A Chief Commissioner who had shown himself too sympathetic to the men was sacked by Mr. Matthews, the Home Secretary. He was replaced by Sir Edward Bradford, who is thus described in *Commonweal*: 'This martinet, fresh from bullying and ill-treating the natives of India, directly he attains office begins his reign of despotism—by issuing an edict forbidding the men to hold public meetings to discuss their grievances ...' This ban was aimed at an all-London delegates' meeting of the police. When the men at Bow Street tried to elect their delegates the chief inspector suspended two men; the rest refused to turn out for night duty until the two were reinstated.

Some 400 delegates arrived at Bow Street, only to find their meeting proclaimed. After an excited gathering on the pavement outside—during which an inspector ordered them to move on and threatened to run them in—they adjourned to the Police Institute and sent in a respectful petition asking for leave to meet at Bow Street the following week. Their petition was contemptuously rejected. Upon this a Circular was sent out by a Bow Street constable urging all divisions to 'make known to your men' that they had a perfect right to petition. Forty men were suspended, some were summarily dismissed and on Monday, July 6, the astounding news appeared in the press that a strike would start that night. Thereupon many Londoners rallied to Bow Street to see what the 'peelers' would do. The strike took place: policemen stayed inside Bow Street, refusing to turn out for duty, and forcibly held back a few blacklegs. Outside the crowd cheered and sang the *Marseillaise* 'with immense vigour'. *Commonweal's* account continues: 'But soon a change came over the spirit of the scene. The mounted men were ordered out. They charged up and down, headed by a superintendent who was evidently labouring under a fit of temporary insanity, during which he could do nothing but shout "Ride over them! Ride them down!" This brutality infuriated the people; they hooted the mounted men, calling them "blacklegs". The ruffianly police grew savage, and they charged on the pavement, trampling down men, boys and women. Stones then began to fly and the crowd, enraged in their turn, struck fiercely at the police with sticks and umbrellas. Missiles of all kinds were showered upon them... Meanwhile the foot police did nothing; they stood and quietly watched the scene, while from the windows of the station policemen waved their hands to the crowd... The swells in carriages coming from the opera had a very warm reception;

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

After Paris - What Next?

Here we have absolutely naked imperialism, which does not even consider it necessary to conceal its nakedness in any way, thinking that it is splendid enough as it is.

Lenin on American Imperialism (Collected Works, Vol. XXXI, p.416, Russian edition.)

A DECADE and a half ago the flight of the V2 heralded the last thrust of Hitlerism before its final downfall. Today the flight of the U2 has signalled the desperate offensive of the cold war fanatics to prevent peace. Nothing is to be gained by underestimating the precarious and dangerous character of the international situation which has now opened. Writing last month on May 12, before the Heads of State had gathered in Paris, we noted the 'far from favourable auspices' for the projected Summit Conference, and even 'doubts on its being held'. This anticipation, unfortunately fulfilled, required no special insight. For the preceding year and more the meaning of the too long delayed Summit Conference had been steadily whittled away by the successive protracted 'Western Summits' proclaiming on every issue rigid inflexible positions on which no negotiation would be permitted. Under these conditions the Summit could at best only have been a first contact towards future negotiation. But we did not anticipate the mailed fist violence of the strategy finally adopted by the enemies of the Summit to prevent its being held.

CONTENTS

Vol. XLII JULY · 1960

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *After Paris—What Next?* by R.P.D.	289
LABOUR'S NUCLEAR POLICY, by W. Wainwright	301
WHAT'S THIS ABOUT BERLIN? by D. N. Pritt, Q.C.	305
PENTAGON WRECKS THE SUMMIT, by 'Quæstor'	311
I'LL HAVE A CUP OF COFFEE, by Shirley Graham	322
A MODERN AMALGAMATION IN PROCESS, by W. J. Michael ...	328
DRAWING: Metropolitan Police on Strike—1890	312-3
VIEWS OF THE WORLD, Rules Revision, by A Delegate ...	331
Book Reviews:	
Studies in the History of Education, by Brian Simon: *G. C. T. Giles*	333
Kiev Rus, by B. L. Grekov: *Robert Browning*	334
F. Dostoyevsky, by V. Yermilov: *Archibald Robertson*	335

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Stage in Cold War Strategy

No parallel to the present extraordinary situation revealed at Paris can be traced in the whole eighteen years since the cold war was originally planned by the Anglo-American leadership in 1942. The cold war may be regarded as dating from 1942, since 1942 was the year of the Churchill Memorandum on the key strategic aim to prepare for a future Western conflict against the Soviet Union. 1942 was the year of the initiation of the 'Manhattan Project' for the construction of the atom bomb with regard to which General Groves, who was in charge, has subsequently stated that he understood from the outset that its real purpose was against the Soviet Union. 1946 was the year of the public inauguration of the Anglo-American cold war, when Churchill's Fulton speech was delivered with Truman presiding. During all these years the widest variety of forms of cold war have been preached and practised by its exponents, including the extremes of brinkmanship and excursions into regional hot wars. All these ventures have ended in failure, not least the dream of atomic monopoly. Hence the increasing trends of sober statesmanship to recognise the necessity for negotiation, and the increasing desperation of the cold war fanatics to find some means to throw a spanner in the works and prevent negotiation for peaceful co-existence.

Beyond the Wrecking of the Summit

This is the situation in which the decision on the eve of the Summit Conference to commit the U2 aggression into the heart of the Soviet Union takes on a special significance far beyond its immediate effect. For this decision was taken with the knowledge, as Defence Secretary Gates has since made clear in evidence, that it could give rise to 'an international incident'. At first the resulting international incident appeared to be failing to wreck the Summit, owing to the pacific attitude of the Soviet Union, which expressly stated that the incident of this aggression, though grave, should not be allowed to interfere with the proceedings of the Summit Conference, but should be regarded as the indiscreet action of a subordinate to be disclaimed (in the usual way, as with Commander Crabbe). Thereupon a new and provocative decision of a far graver character was taken by the American authorities, calculated to force a crisis. This was the decision of President Eisenhower, after full consultation with the heads of the Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the Chiefs of Staff, to uphold this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admitted violation of international law as authorised and justifiable. It is obvious that this decision takes on a significance far beyond the immediate effect on the Paris meeting. It is not only significant because it wrecked the Summit Conference. It is of continuing present significance as a new and extreme stage of cold war strategy without previous parallel. The understanding of this new stage of cold war strategy is the key to the understanding of the new and more advanced stage of the fight for peace which now opens.

A Revealing Controversy

A resounding controversy has followed the Paris fiasco. The accusation of 'wrecking the Summit Conference' has been expressed on both sides. The charge has not only been expressed by the representatives of the socialist camp and supporters of peace against the American militarists who in fact dispatched the U2 and have since insisted on their right to commit aggression. It has been expressed no less vehemently by Western propagandists against the victims of aggression on the grounds that the latter demanded the repudiation of such aggression. The issues of this controversy, and the question of what really happened at Paris, are dealt with by our diplomatic correspondent Quæstor elsewhere in this number. We do not need to pursue the details of this controversy further here.

Drawing the Lesson

But the fact that the accusation of wrecking the Summit Conference has thus been made the centre of controversy since Paris is evidence of the universal recognition by all, irrespective of political colour, that the hopes of the peoples in all countries were turned towards the Summit Conference, and that the breakdown has been a source of deep disappointment for all the peoples and of just anger against those responsible. The flaming anger of Khrushchov at Paris has been made the main count in the Western indictment against him (since on the actual issue it has to be admitted that he was in the right). On the contrary, it is the main certificate in his honour, just as the smooth-spoken smug consciously lying complacency and self-satisfaction of the others betrayed them. In the downfall of the Summit one man at the top was genuinely angry. One man expressed the genuine feelings of the people. This blazing anger was the just anger of the honest man who cared about the Summit, finding himself in the midst of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glib-tongued, double-dealing, deliberately and admittedly lying spivs and crooks, or subservient satellites who in docility to their gangster big chief dared not speak aloud the truth they knew and admitted in private.

From Anger to Action

But anger and disappointment are not enough. It is necessary to move on, just as Khrushchov and the Soviet Union have moved on to the new proposals for peace and disarmament. Certainly the lesson of Paris needs to be learned. But the militarist cold war offensive which wrecked the Summit is continuing in new forms and threatening further aggression, as at this moment in East Asia. Nuclear arms, including the projected Polaris, are being handed to Adenauer. A 24-hour Anglo-American nuclear alert has been ordered. No time can be lost for the peace movement to gather its strength in order to meet the new conditions. For this purpose it is essential to recognise and define the new factor, which now confronts us since Paris, and which governs the new conditions in the fight for peace.

New Doctrine of the Right of Aggression

What is this new factor? All the infantile prattle about 'espionage' in general ('everybody does it', 'we are men of the world', 'why all the fuss?') is a transparently insincere attempt to cover up the glaring new fact. 'It was hypocritical of Khrushchov or anyone else to complain of spying as such, since we all do it' (Kingsley Martin, *New Statesman*, May 28, 1960). So, too, the comedy of Lodge's production of the plaque and microphone in the United Nations debate (the original being varingly reported in the press to date from 1955, 1952, 1946, 1943 and even 1936). Under cover of this irrelevance the attempt is made to conceal from view the real question of air aggression. Similarly the claim that the practice of these flights for four years and Soviet knowledge of these flights proved that there was no new issue relevant to the Summit Conference. On the contrary, the Soviet Note explicitly made clear that the mere fact of the flight, however serious, should not be an obstacle to Summit negotiations. It was only when, in place of the normal face-saving diplomatic disavowal and apology (as in the case of the American bandit planes caught over Indonesia and Cuba) the United States Government finally decided, after the exposure of the 'weather plane' and 'off course' lies, and after a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long consultation of Eisenhower and Dulles, to proclaim the right to commit air aggression, in defiance of international law, and insisted on maintaining this right, even at the cost of killing the Summit Conference, that a new situation was created. The last-minute offer to suspend such flights for a few months only emphasised the claim of the right to resume them at any time thought fit. Under these conditions negotiation for peace became impossible until this new doctrine of the right of aggression could be repudiated. A previous question has been raised—the question of the right of aggression. This is the new question which now confronts the peace movement.

A Menace to All Countries

The stark, brutal, glaring new fact of the present international situation since Paris needs to be stated very plainly—for every device and trick is being used to hide it from the consciousness of the people. It is not a question of a past controversy about what happened at Paris. It is a present fact. The United States today, since Paris, officially, publicly and on the highest level claims the right to invade any country at will, 1,200 miles into the interior, in open and proclaimed defiance of international law, with a plane capable of carrying a nuclear bomb (and the invaded country cannot of course know whether or not the particular illegal unnotified plane is carrying a nuclear bomb, until it is too late). It is obvious that acceptance of this doctrine would place every country at the mercy of the United States. It is obvious that this doctrine is a public menace, not merely to the Soviet Union, but to every country in the world. It is equally a menace to the invaded country, which could be destroyed at will by the United States aggressor plane without any declaration of war or means of defence. It is equally a menace to the country unwise enough to permit American bases on its territory, from which the aggressor planes can take off.

Base Accomplices

For it would be vain to plead, as Pakistan sought to plead, that it could not be responsible for where the American planes departed to from its bases. The acceptance of the American bases or military occupation constitutes the responsibility, and makes the country an accomplice in aggression and a target. Hence the protests of Pakistan and Norway. Mr. Gaitskell would do well to consider the significance of these protests before he dares to talk of the 'defence'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Britain in connection with NATO and the American bases. When Premier Khrushchov insisted on the repudiation of this doctrine of the right of aggression as a prior condition before negotiation could begin, he was making a stand, not only for the defence of the Soviet Union, but for the defence of every country in the world, for peace. It now becomes the urgent concern of the whole peace movement, and of all peoples standing for peace, to compel the speedy repudiation of this new American doctrine of the right of aggression, in order to open the path for further negotiations. But the fulfilment of this fight will necessarily involve the fight (as the further development of the present discussion in the Labour Party and trade unions and peace movement in Britain is increasingly making clear) against the whole system of American bases, nuclear strategy and sectional war alliances. The tangled web of cold war aggression is not easily separated into its component parts.

Farewell to Legality

Aggression is nothing new from the practitioners of the cold war. Ceaseless aggression, invasion, military occupation and local wars in every part of the world have been conducted by Western, and especially American, imperialism during the past decade and a half since the end of the second world war. But hitherto every aggression, even the most violent, has been covered under a pretence of legality and of respect for international law. Thus the war of aggression and invasion by American imperialism and its satellites against the Korean people was stated—falsely, to have been authorised by the United Nations, on the basis of the in fact illegal vote of the Security Council.* Similarly with the whole ugly brood of NATO, SEATO and CENTO. All are sectional military alliances, expressly forbidden by the Charter of the United Nations, unless directed against Germany or Japan. But the shamefaced attempt was made to 'prove' their legitimacy, at first as 'regional pacts' permitted by the Charter. Then it was discovered that the Charter expressly forbade regional pacts to have any rights of independent decision for military action. Hence the official line has become to offer the fantastic sophistry of treating them as covered by Article 51 on collective self-defence *after* an attack (although military alliances before an attack are forbidden).

*See D. N. Pritt, Q.C., 'What's This About Korea', *Labour Monthly*, June, 1960, for a summary of the unchallengeable facts about the Korean War, which are kept hidden from people today under cover of a lying myth, as with virtually every episode of the cold war. Attention is also called to D. N. Pritt's article giving the truth about Berlin in the current issue

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Similarly with the ceaseless acts of aggression in the Far East and the Middle East. The new feature about the U2 aggression and the decision of the American Government to justify it is that for the first time no attempt has been made to find the flimsiest legal pretext for this admitted violation of international law. The justification has been officially stated to be military necessity and the strategic interests of the United States.

A Hitlerite Landmark

Thus the new declaration of policy of the United States Government, following the U2 aggression, represents a landmark of Hitler-type significance in the development of the cold war strategy—a landmark comparable to the moment when Hitler first threw off the initial cloak of pretended respect for international legality, and ostentatiously withdrew from the Disarmament Conference and League of Nations. The plea of justification of air aggression in defiance of international law has been framed to present it as supposedly indispensable for defence against the menace of 'surprise attack'. The innocent might imagine that the menace of 'surprise attack' arises rather for the country which is invaded by the American plane than for the aggressor. But it is characteristic of the one-way egoism of the American military mind that it could not even contemplate the possibility of the victims of aggression having any objection to being subjected to the real (not imaginary) menace of 'surprise attack'. In practice, however, the early official plea of 'defence' was soon dropped, like the previous official pretences about the 'weather survey' and 'off course' and the 'loss of oxygen' and the 'civilian' character of the plane (oddly enough, when President Eisenhower announced his decision in Paris to suspend the flights, he gave the lie to his own previous insistence on the 'civilian' character of the plane by announcing that he had given his instructions to this effect to the Defence Air Secretary and Air Chief of Staff). By the time that Allen Dulles was giving his evidence to Congressional leaders, he made clear, according to the American press, that the object of the flights was 'primarily designed to pinpoint targets for the Strategic Air Force' (*Sunday Times*, May 29, 1960), *i.e.*, that the object was offensive.

'Not Kennt Kein Gebot'

The doctrine of 'military necessity' and 'strategic interests' to justify aggression and override international law—now openly pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claimed by the present American ruling group of President Eisenhower (always assuming that his words can be treated as his own, or that he knows the meaning of what he says), Allen Dulles and the Central Intelligence Agency, and General Twining and the Pentagon Chiefs—has a long and in modern times somewhat notorious history. This was the familiar doctrine proclaimed by Hitler in his aggression and the second world war whenever he found it necessary to invade Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, the Balkans, or eventually the Soviet Union, in order to 'forestall' a 'surprise attack'. This was the doctrine equally proclaimed by German imperialism at the outset of the first world war, when the German militarists invaded Belgium in 1914 in violation of international law and of the treaty obligations guaranteeing Belgian neutrality signed by Germany, and Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg justified the aggression on the grounds that '*Not kennt kein Gebot*' 'Necessity knows no law.' Thus this doctrine of 'military necessity' overriding international law to 'forestall surprise attack' has already ushered in two world wars. Now that this same official doctrine has been officially adopted, along with so much else of the Hitler-Goebbels-Krupp Axis 'Anti-Comintern' paraphernalia and slogans, by the American military and political chiefs (with official Britain's acquiescence), let us be on guard to make sure that it does not usher in a third.

On Guard

There is no excuse for illusions. The militarists who have been caught red-handed, and who have had to admit and glory in their aggression and violation of international law, are now in the position of convicted criminals. They have lost their mantle of respectability. Their most solemn official statements are by their own admission lies. Indeed, Senator Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and in charge of the inquiry into the U2 incident, has publicly stated that the main error of President Eisenhower was that he failed to go the whole hog and insist that the whole U2 incident was an invention and fabrication by the Russians. Their credit has fallen to zero. The peoples are rising against them, even in the hitherto most 'reliable' satellite territories. The peoples are rising against the imposed dictators who have turned their countries into American bases and arsenals or mercenary recruiting grounds. In Turkey they have driven out Menderes. In South Korea they have driven out Syngman Rhee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In South Vietnam they are rising against Ngo Diem. In Japan against Kishi.* Even in Britain, long-suffering docile Britain, the revolt in the Labour Party against the H-bomb and Gaitskell's subservience to the United States is the national expression of this universal movement (and it is characteristic that Gaitskell, like the reactionaries in every country, has sought to exploit the successful torpedoing of the Summit as a bull point for his campaign for nuclear strategy). In these circumstances we must be prepared for new and more reckless aggressions from the American militarists and their accomplices. For they know that time is against them.

Cui Bono?

When a murder has been committed, and the identity of the murderer is in dispute, the old legal maxim raises the question *Cui Bono?* Who gained? Since the killing of the Summit Conference has been universally recognised by all commentators as murder, but the responsibility is in dispute, it may here also be useful to apply the same old legal maxim. Who profited by the wrecking of the Summit Conference? The arms manufacturers, we know. Who else? There is no doubt about the answer. The strongest open opponents of a Summit Conference were the American militarists, Adenauer Germany and the protagonists of the cold war. On the very eve of the Conference President Eisenhower was expressing doubts whether he would go, and Secretary of State Herter was throwing cold water on the whole idea as one to which the U.S. Government had only agreed because the British and French Governments had pressed for it and from which no useful results were to be expected. The hostility of Chancellor Adenauer was even more open.

'The End of Summitry?'

After the successful torpedoing of the Conference the satisfaction of these same quarters has been unmistakable, even behind the smokescreen of pretended indignation and accusations against the Soviet Union. This has not only been visible from the West German press or the unrestrained jubilations of the American military chiefs. Also in Britain, which had most to lose from the breakdown (for the breakdown was in fact a diplomatic defeat for

*The cancellation of the Eisenhower visit enforced by the Japanese people (surely unique as a rebuff to a 'Head of State') took place on June 16 after these Notes were written. It did not surprise readers of *Labour Monthly* which alone amongst political magazines, last winter forecast the storm blowing up in the article 'Japan Today' (November, 1959) by Sanzo Nosaka, chairman of the Communist Party of Japan, who was one of our original contributors in 1921.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain and the policy of Macmillan, who had staked everything on the Summit, but was impotent because he feared to free himself from the American straitjacket), the satisfaction of influential reactionary circles found expression in the leading Conservative organ:

> Should we regret the collapse of the Summit Conference? We may deplore the circumstance, but approve the fact. For if the Conference had 'succeeded', it could have done so, in all probability, only from the Russian point of view. (*Daily Telegraph*, May 20, 1960.)

A week later the same Conservative organ was expressing in an editorial under the title 'Replacing Summitry' the hope that no Summit Conference would take place 'for many years':

> Summitry has once again suffered a crippling blow. Versailles, Munich, Yalta and now Paris—the record of Summitry surely rules out any return to this method for many years. (*Daily Telegraph*, May 27, 1960.)

Short-Term Jubilation

Thus in a short-term calculation the torpedoing of the Summit fulfilled the hopes and desires of the aggressive military cold war circles, and in that sense could even be regarded by them as a tactical victory. But a longer term calculation would show a different significance for the outcome. For the outcome has in fact powerfully exposed the aggressive strategy of the American militarists and cold war politicians, and has thereby further mobilised and strengthened the fight of the peoples for peace against the war plans of the imperialists.

Bellicose Moves and Threats

What is the picture of the world after the Paris breakdown? From the side of the Western powers, a hurricane of new moves to speed up the cold war and the arms race and prepare new military adventures. Britain's Minister of Defence hastens to the United States to purchase the Skybolt pig in a poke. U.S. army chiefs publicly urge that Polaris must be supplied to West German Neo-Nazism since its range could reach into the heart of the Soviet Union. The U.S.-Japanese Military Treaty is rushed through against the mass resistance of the Japanese people. A special U.S. 'strike force' of 120 planes is dispatched to South-East Asia, alongside strengthened U.S. military control and reinforcements in South Vietnam and Laos (in violation of the Geneva Agreements), and the parallel dispatch of parachute units of the British Strategic Reserve to Singapore. 'Britain and the United States are quietly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preparing for a flare-up in the Far East' (*Evening Standard*, June 7, 1960), Anglo-American plans are announced for a 24-hour continuous H-bomb patrol to ensure 'considerable forces within striking distance of Russia all the time' (*Daily Telegraph*, June 13, 1960). Once, such mobilisation would have been considered the next step to war. With the hazards of modern planes, carrying H-bombs, it would be difficult to imagine a device better calculated to bring within view at any moment the possibility of an explosion.

Soviet Disarmament Plan

From the side of the socialist world the first new step since the Paris breakdown has been the presentation of the new Soviet disarmament plan, elaborately worked out and devised to meet all the Western objections to general disarmament as set out in the original draft. Thus for example the new draft proposes that the very first stage should include the destruction of all missiles and banning of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons (*i.e.*, the sphere in which the Soviet Union has the most marked superiority) at the same time as the dismantling of all bases on foreign soil (which have in any case now become vulnerable and of diminishing military value). Similarly the proposals for the fullest control and inspection have been elaborately worked over to meet every point raised by the West. On the question of the Summit Conference, emphasis is laid on the necessity to continue to work for this aim, as soon as the West is ready for peaceful negotiation. 'We can wait.' The vast adjustments involved in the demobilisation of the two million soldiers and officers and their harmonious integration into civilian life and production continue (one of the comic features of the Western mock 'disarmament' plan was that it proposed as a first stage, not only no disarmament at all, but 'limitation' of armed forces to a figure higher than the existing Soviet armed forces). The Seven-Year Plan is reinforced with the preparation of a Twenty-Year Plan, holding out perspectives unparallelled in history which now draw within reach through the organised use of resources for human benefit. A contrast indeed to the nuclear frenzies of the Western militarists. Two worlds. Two ways of life.

A New Stage in the Fight for Peace

The new bellicose moves of the West since Paris are not a sign of strength, although the sharpest vigilance and reinforcement of the popular fight for peace is needed against the menace they repre-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent. Like the reckless adventure of the U2 aggression, and the subsequent torpedoing of the Summit Conference, all these moves are rather a measure of the increasing weakness and consequent dangerous desperation of the cold war militarist forces, as they see the balance of the world moving inexorably against them. But it is essential for supporters of peace to draw the lesson of Paris and recognise the new stage of the fight for peace which now in consequence follows. Previously the simple essential theme was to present the necessity for negotiation for peaceful co-existence in place of the cold war and nuclear strategy. The experience of the Paris breakdown has shown that it is necessary to do more. It is necessary to take effective steps to end the present aggressions of the cold war in order to establish the conditions for peaceful negotiation. The fight for a future Summit Conference and for the future aim of peaceful co-existence cannot be separated from the fight against the present practice of the cold war and nuclear strategy, against the American bases and aggressive NATO menace. If this lesson is taken to heart and acted on by supporters of peace throughout the world, then the outcome of the Paris breakdown will be a new and strengthened advance of the fight for peace.

June 14, 1960. R.P.D.

CONTENTS OF PAST ISSUES 1960

APRIL: *Lenin After 90 Years* (R.P.D.); *Naked in the Conference Chamber* (Ivor Montagu); *Why We are Marching* (Anna Steele); *Peace in My Time* (Jim Arnison); *Sedatives or Socialism?* (R. W. Wright); *Views of the World:* by P. C. Walters, George Bolton, W. H. Gardner; *Failure of the 'Mixed Economy'* (John Eaton); *If Sharks Were Human* (Bertolt Brecht); *Take-Over Bid in Israel* (Lazar Zaidman); *The History of Ernie Bevin, Labour Leader* (J. R. Campbell). BOOK REVIEWS: *Our Fight for Canada* (Tim Buck); *Notes of a Film Director* (Sergei Eisenstein); *Socialism and Religion* (Archibald Robertson); *Spotlight on Coal* (Jock Kane); *Astronomy for Entertainment* (Y. Perelman); reviewed by: W. Gallacher, S. Cole, Bob Stewart, Guy Stobbs, W. A. Granger, F.R.A.S.

MAY: *Black and White* (R.P.D.); *Forbid the Banns* (Bert Ramelson); *Zig-Zags and Skirmishes* (Quæstor); *Benefits of Disarmament* (R. W. Briginshaw); *Benefits of Disarmament* (Percy Belcher); *Campaigners—Unite!* (S. R. Broadbridge); *It's Our Future* (Eiblis O'Shea); *Failure of 'Mixed Economy'* (John Eaton); *Views of the World:* by W. Moore and A. McDonald. BOOK REVIEWS: *Dmitri Shostakovich* (D. Rabinovich); *Entertainment in the Soviet Union* (Harry Francis); *The Foundry Workers* (H. J. Fyrth and H. Collins); *The First Indian War of Independence* (Marx and Engels); reviewed by: Alan Bush, Harry Francis, T. Ainley; C. P. Dutt.

JUNE: *Summit and After* (R.P.D.); *A Black Tercentenary; Men of Metal on the Move* ('Vulcan'); *What's this about Korea?* (D. N. Pritt, Q.C.); *More Memories of Lenin* (N. Krupskaya); *A New Town* (A. H. Luker); *Views of the World:* by P. G. Oliphant, Judy Atkinson, H.G.S.; *Document of the Month: Conakry Declaration.* BOOK REVIEW: *Meeting Soviet Man* (M. Clark), reviewed by Archibald Robertson.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR'S NUCLEAR POLICY

William Wainwright

WHAT is Labour's 'new' nuclear policy? It turns out to be a rehash of the old right-wing line of backing for the Pentagon and its nuclear strategy. In no respect does it meet the rising demand for a change. Far from improving the security of this country it puts Britain even more at the mercy of the American militarists. It even limits its objection to the nuclear arming of Western Germany to 'the present circumstances'. There is nothing in the document to give the Pentagon a moment of worry or to disturb the Tory Government.

In past years Labour's right wing used the fraudulent argument as in their 1955 resolution* that Britain must not be dependent on the U.S.A. for nuclear weapons. Even as recently as the March 1 Defence Debate, Gaitskell was still perpetrating the same fraud, saying that without nuclear weapons of our own he feared 'that an excessive dependence on the United States might force upon us policies with which we do not agree'. The Blue Streak fiasco knocked the bottom out of the case that British nuclear weapons could make us less dependent on the U.S. and a more potent force for peace in the world. But does Gaitskell accept the logic of his own argument? By no means. He merely stands on his head and argues the very opposite. The new statement now urges that Britain *must be* dependent on America for nuclear weapons, and in doing so proves beyond shadow of doubt the fraudulent character of all the previous arguments that British nuclear weapons were needed to preserve British independence.

The reasons the right wing gives for supporting the nuclear strategy have nothing to do with the truth. The real reasons are contained in the essential elements of right wing aims which may be summed up as: support for the Pentagon's nuclear weapon campaign against Socialism; commitment to NATO and rearmament of West Germany; and the aim of a bipartisan foreign and defence policy with the Tories. All the right wing arguments are merely devices to conceal these real aims and to divert attention from the real danger. Participation in NATO and other aspects of the

*'Labour believes that it is undesirable that Britain should be dependent on another country for this vital weapon (the hydrogen bomb). If we were, our influence for peace would be lessened in the councils of the world. It was for that reason that the Labour Government decided on the manufacture of the atomic bomb and that we support the production of the hydrogen bomb in this country.' March 30, 1955. Labour Party Executive Resolution.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pentagon's policy have been sold to the movement as steps which are needed because of an alleged Soviet threat to peace. But the tide of events has steadily eroded the false foundations of this policy and exposed the 'big lie' of the Soviet threat.

Year by year it has become more difficult for the right wing to defeat the opponents of the tie-up with the Pentagon. Last year the 'non-nuclear club' was produced (have three words ever concealed a bigger lie?); the year before a Declaration accompanied by a Strachey-Gaitskell pamphlet. This year, four scribes—Messrs. Healey, Crossman, Brown and Morgan Phillips—have taken part in the annual period of gestation, rehashing the old stuff to make it look as new, hoping that what is produced will look more attractive in the eye of the beholder than the 'non-nuclear club' which was dead before even the ink was dry. This time the right wing faces greater problems than ever in finding new arguments to bolster up its old discredited policies. The 'big lie' of the Soviet threat is exposed. More people see that the threat to peace comes from the U.S.A. and that the drive for peace comes from the U.S.S.R. More people see that to be tied up with the U.S.A. brings terrible dangers of nuclear war by blunder or deliberate plan dragging us in without a chance to say no. How on earth to keep the movement backing the Pentagon and nuclear weapons in these circumstances—especially when the Pentagon, after the U2 flight and other provocations is becoming the most hated and distrusted organisation in the world?

Thus at the moment when there is greater understanding than ever that the fight to rid Britain of nuclear weapons needs to be linked with a fight to end the tie up with NATO's nuclear strategy and to close the American bases here, Gaitskell and Co. are emerging as the chief campaigners on the Pentagon's behalf in Britain to preserve the NATO nuclear war alliance and to keep alive the 'big lie' of the alleged Soviet threat. As a cold war propagandist Gaitskell has become more active on this subject these days than the leading Tories. This, however, is not making his policy easier to swallow. His fictions about Soviet aims do not correspond with the facts of life. Despite all efforts of the right wing to resurrect the bolshevik bogey, support for policies involving a basic change away from the nuclear strategy are steadily gaining ground at the trade union conferences. The right wing are panic stricken lest last year's substantial minority for abolition by Britain of nuclear weapons becomes this year's majority at the T.U.C. and the Labour Party Conference.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The 'new' statement again lays down the essential principle of all right wing policy: 'we remain loyal supporters of NATO': and to help them to continue to put it across, they remind the movement that 'the Labour Party played a leading role' in its creation—as though the commission of a crime in the past is any justification for its repetition in the future. 'Remaining loyal to NATO' not only means loyalty to the men of the Pentagon. It also means loyalty to the Tory Government whose participation in NATO also continues. How on earth is Labour to be an Opposition when it is pledging itself to be loyal to the very people it needs to oppose? To be 'loyal' to NATO also involves loyalty to other NATO partners, such as West Germany. And it must also mean 'loyalty' to stooges of American policy all over the world—Chiang on Formosa, Franco in Spain and so on. 'Loyalty' to NATO makes Labour subservient to Toryism and to American imperialism, and must inevitably continue to render the Opposition utterly ineffective in Parliament and to weaken it in the country.

The statement tries to make a case for British forces, in future to be equipped by Britain only with 'conventional' weapons, to use nuclear weapons provided by the Americans through NATO. Other members of NATO would also use the nuclear weapons provided by the U.S. Since this obviously means greater control by the Americans over the military forces contributed to NATO, the right wing attempts to produce a formula to quieten the critics. The idea is that there shall be a strengthening of the NATO Council of Foreign Ministers and Defence Ministers to decide 'whether such weapons are to be used' and 'to improve co-operation on foreign policy'. Even if this proposal were accepted it could only be a camouflage for the reality of American control. Are the moguls of the U.S.A. likely to hand over their Western monopoly of the 'strategic' nuclear missile to a committee of their subservient junior partners? A political body attached to NATO could and would only serve to rubber stamp what would in effect be American decisions, and far from giving Britain greater influence is much more likely to lessen it. Indeed the phrase 'improve co-operation on foreign policy' has an ominous ring to it for this could only mean to improve co-operation in the cold war campaign.

In addition to providing nuclear weapons to the NATO forces, the Americans are of course to have nuclear weapons for their own independent use. As this is another source of possible involvement of Britain in a nuclear war as a result of an American aggressive act, the Labour scribes propose to beseech the Pentagon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to consult Britain before they launch their nuclear weapons. We can just imagine the laugh when the news of this gets around to the toughs who man the Pentagon's nuclear set-up. The essence of American nuclear strategy is that the 'nuclear strike' must be launched in secret so that the victim is taken by surprise. To hand over what would be in effect part control of American nuclear policy would be out of the question for America's rulers to contemplate. The Thor missile bases are 'opposed' for the same reason that the Blue Streak was 'opposed'—they are vulnerable and therefore useless. But there is no opposition to American bases in Britain. In consequence Britain would become even more of an H-bomb base than before, following a decision to rely exclusively on imports of American nuclear weapons.

There is no unconditional opposition to nuclear arms for West Germany, but opposition only 'in present circumstances' which might of course be a reference to the United States elections and the bad effect a public announcement of an agreement to provide West Germany with these weapons would have. But what is ignored is the fact that West Germany has already obtained a variety of weapons capable of firing atomic missiles of a Hiroshima strength: the statement by omitting it accepts this dangerous situation. Silence means consent.

Indeed there are indications of deliberate confusion in the wording of references to nuclear weapons not only in the case of West Germany but also in Britain's case. For there is a considerable body of opinion that atomic weapons which could each do as much damage as the Hiroshima bomb must now be considered to be 'conventional' because they are so widespread in the U.S., British and NATO forces. What is not clear is whether the idea that Britain should not make nuclear weapons means that atomic bombs should also no longer be made.

Fears of arms manufacturers that the shift by Britain to conventional weapon equipment of British forces will mean cuts in arms expenditure are quietened by the explicit statement that 'defence' spending will continue at the existing level. Indeed the armed forces are to be provided with more effective 'conventional' weapons and Britain will be obliged by these cold war warriors to bring its forces in Europe 'up to full strength'—which means more atom fodder for the United States, a policy long campaigned for by the Pentagon.

The right wing says that the policy of the left would leave Britain without the means of defence. This is the opposite of the military

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that the nuclear tie-up renders the defence of Britain impossible. The only policy which can defend Britain is one which ends the nuclear strategy and this tie-up and reverses the processes leading to a nuclear war. Such a policy could be achieved by independent renunciation by Britain of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons; the closing of all American bases on British soil; no nuclear weapons or bases for Adenauer; an end to the NATO nuclear strategy and replacement of the NATO and WARSAW Pact organisations by a European Security Treaty based on the United Nations; British Government pressure for an immediate test ban agreement and a speed up in the disarmament negotiations.

This summer and at the T.U.C. and Labour Party, the right wing will do its utmost to present its basic old line of NATO, nuclear war strategy and alliance with the Pentagon, in this new and tricky way. The utmost unity of all working for peace and an end to the nuclear threat is needed to defeat the danger of still another year shackling Labour to NATO. If this year the change is made, there is the chance not only of transforming the policy of this country, but in so doing, of contributing to a tremendous transformation for peace throughout the world.

WHAT'S THIS ABOUT BERLIN?

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

YOU ask me, John, what is at the back of the fuss about Berlin that is always being raised by the Americans and British, and the West (Adenauer) Germans too; why, whenever there seem to be better hopes of successful negotiations, they all start shouting at the tops of their snarls that they will never desert the 'heroes' of West Berlin, nor withdraw their forces, nor alter their policy; and why Adenauer—the American puppet turned Frankenstein—shouts even more bitterly than the rest at any idea of budging even an inch. You want to know how the situation arose; why the Western Powers and their armed forces are in Berlin; whether they have any right to be there, or anything to do there; why they insist on staying; and what the 'blockade' of Berlin really was. These are important questions, for the situation is highly dangerous, and you don't get the truth from the capitalist press; indeed the 'heroism' and the untouchability of Berlin have become myths, like Korea and the equality of Negroes in the U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The story of Berlin is part of the story of post-war Germany and the cold war, but it is a distinct story by itself. When the war ended, Germany was of course occupied, in accordance with the Potsdam agreement, and was divided into four zones, each occupied and governed by one of the four Powers. For the purposes of the occupation, which was to lead to the establishment of one peaceful democratic German state, and to the negotiation of a peace treaty with that state, a central Control Council was set up by the Powers to deal with all matters of central administration and to carry through agreed Allied policies, during the occupation. Berlin, the capital of Germany since 1871, was chosen as the seat of this Control Council, and was governed jointly by the four Powers, the city being divided into four sectors. It lay deep inside the Soviet zone, but it was in no sense a special occupation area; the Western Powers and their armed forces had no function in the city, nor any justification for being there, save so long and so far as they were fulfilling the Potsdam agreement by virtue of which they were there, were working in the Control Council, and were (with the Soviet Union) occupying Germany. Most people expected a fairly quick establishment of the new State, and a peace treaty; and some even expected that the West would not gang up against the U.S.S.R., but would work sincerely with it in the Control Council and generally. But the cold war developed, and co-operation grew at first difficult and then impossible; and as early as March 23, 1948, the Control Council ceased to function, and all central allied control, policy, or even administration of Germany came to an end. The Western Powers governed their three Zones on their own, and soon fused two of them (the American and the British) into 'Bizonia', which was very shortly turned into 'Trizonia'. By the middle of 1948, they had turned Trizonia into a substantially independent sovereign State called the German Federal Republic, under Adenauer as Chancellor, and had formally ended the occupation of that country. The first thing to understand is that, at least as soon as they thus ended the occupation, and probably as soon as they had ended all the work of the Control Council in 1948, the Western Powers had lost all rights, reasons and justifications for sitting in Berlin, let alone for maintaining troops there. The case against their holding on there was by then overwhelming in law, morals, politics and common decency.

See how it works out. Firstly, the sole basis on which it was ever agreed that they should be in Berlin was that they had made the Potsdam agreement; and it is good common sense and plain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

honesty, as well as law, that a man cannot break his word and neglect his duties under an agreement and at the same time claim the benefit of it. And they had been breaking Potsdam from a very much earlier date. At Potsdam they pledged themselves to put an end to German militarism and fascism, and to keep Germany unarmed; but we all know that they were plotting from a very early stage to build up huge armed forces in West Germany, thus inevitably re-creating both militarism and fascism. They had promised too, to root out the Nazi Party, and to ensure that there should be no revival of Nazism; but they have allowed the wholesale employment of Nazis in important public offices in West Germany and the establishment of scores and hundreds of new Nazi organisations. They had also agreed to break up the great industrial monopolies; but they have made them more powerful and concentrated than ever, even taking one of the tycoons (Krupp) out of prison and giving him back his millions to help in the work. And, finally, they had agreed to play their part in setting up one democratic and peaceful German state and making a peace treaty with it in accordance with Potsdam principles; and they have made that virtually impossible by setting up in the West the aggressive and militarist Adenauer state. So the West certainly can't rely on Potsdam; nor can they pretend to have any agreed functions to perform in Berlin. And there never was any reason for their maintaining troops there except as part of the forces of the occupation, which they have formally declared to be at an end.*

So, so far as being in Berlin goes, they quite simply have no right to be there. But before I discuss why they insist on staying, at the price of ruining every chance of international settlement by refusing to consider any kind of compromise, I must tell you the story of the 'blockade'. This takes us back to the middle of 1948. The story began on June 20 of that year, when the Western Powers suddenly introduced into Trizonia (it wasn't yet the German Federal Republic) a separate currency, which had in fact been secretly printed in the U.S.A. some eight months earlier. Up to that time, the whole of Germany had used one single currency. This step was a serious blow not just to prospects of a re-unified Germany, and to peace, but to East Germany (the Soviet Zone); for currency

*The troops now in Western Germany are not in occupation of a conquered country by virtue of the conquerors' power and the agreement of the victorious Powers; they are there by the consent of the German Federal Republic as part of an arrangement (or, if you will, a conspiracy) called NATO, designed to 'defend Western civilisation from aggression from the U.S.S.R.', of which country the most intelligent of anti-Soviet Americans, Mr. George F. Kennan, wrote in an article in *Die Welt*, an important W. German daily in 1956: 'The picture of a Russia longing to attack the West . . . was largely a creation of Western phantasy, against which some of us, who were really acquainted with Russian affairs, raised our voices in vain for years and years'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is funny stuff, and if a country one way or another gets more of it than is needed for running the economy its value (purchasing power) drops catastrophically, just as the price of potatoes would drop if the market were suddenly flooded with three times as many potatoes as people really needed, and East Germany obviously needed only about one-third of the total available for all Germany. Thus, if the Soviet authorities had not acted quickly, the old currency from West Germany would have overflowed into the East, with all the effects of a gigantic inflation. Any such disaster could have been more easily headed off if there had been no currency frontier except the line between West and East Germany; but the Western Powers insisted on also introducing the new currency into West Berlin, in the middle of the Soviet Zone. In Berlin, the sector boundaries run in and out all over the place, so that there was no hope of averting catastrophe there except by stopping communications through East Germany between West Germany and West Berlin.

Of course, the closing of the frontiers created a problem for West Berlin. Economically, it had always been an unworkable place, and in the early days after the war it had had vast unemployment, which could have been cured in a week by letting the West Berliners take jobs in East Berlin, where the Socialist economy could give them plenty of work; but the West had forbidden them to do that, and had made them exist on the dole, which they spent in buying themselves their necessities in East Berlin. And at all stages it has been kept going only by vast subsidies, and can never get enough to eat without huge supplies from outside (either from the East or the West). It had in fact always drawn a good deal of its necessaries from the West, by road or rail across the East-West German frontier, as well as from the East German territories that surrounded it. When the frontiers had to be sealed, the Soviet authorities had no desire or intention to starve the Berliners of food and coal, and expressly offered to supply them with everything of that sort that they needed, but that was the last thing the Western Powers wanted. They wanted to get the maximum propaganda profit they could (and one of their generals even wanted to take a train through to Berlin by force of arms). So they proclaimed that Berlin was 'blockaded', and would be starved to death if they did not organise the 'air-lift', a service of planes flying into West Berlin at the rate of one every five minutes, for months on end. And they claimed that they were thus 'defeating' the 'blockade' and feeding the 'heroic' population of West Berlin; but in actual fact the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western sectors of the city were kept going by daily deliveries of 900 tons of foodstuffs from the East, in addition to a certain amount of coal, textiles, and other commodities. (Incidentally, the economic nonsense of the whole thing can be illustrated by the fact that the actual cost of transport alone for each ton of coal that went to West Berlin over the 'air-lift' was £24.) Nevertheless, they went on shouting about 'blockade' for months; it must surely have been the only blockade in history in which the besieged were kept alive by vast contributions from the besiegers! I remember that on one occasion in the House of Commons, when one of the Ministers referred to the 'blockade' in an answer to a parliamentary question, I asked him why he called it a blockade when 900 tons of food a day were being provided by the 'blockaders', he made no attempt to deny the facts, but said that he called it a 'blockade' because the Soviet authorities were not supplying as much as the West wanted of all the commodities it wanted!

The reality of the situation was neatly betrayed by John Foster Dulles on January 10, 1949, in a talk with the Overseas Writers' Association.* He told his hearers that it would be easy to solve the Berlin dispute at any moment by agreeing on the currency question. 'But', he added with sudden truth,

> the deadlock is of great advantage to the U.S. for propaganda purposes; and secondly the danger in settling the Berlin dispute resides in the fact that it would then be impossible to avoid facing the problem of a German Peace Treaty. The U.S.A. would then be faced with a Soviet proposal for the withdrawal of all occupation troops and the establishment of a central German government. Frankly, I do not know what we could say to that.

In all the circumstances, you can see, John, that it was not easy to negotiate a settlement, which takes two to agree and the air-lift went on for months, at appalling expense. One reason for not settling, in addition to those mentioned by Dulles, was that the Western Powers wanted to use the great tension of the blockade to get general Western agreement for the establishment of NATO, which I have already mentioned; and it is significant that the settlement of the Berlin blockade and the agreement on NATO came within a day or two of each other, in April, 1949, and that the German Federal Republic was set up almost immediately after. (Within a few months, in October, 1949, the German Democratic Republic was established and Berlin now lies in the middle of that Republic.)

*See *Labour Monthly*, June, 1949, pp. 178, 179.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are now in Germany two separate sovereign or virtually sovereign states, and there is neither any vestige of a central government nor any near prospect of one German state being established. Berlin is still a divided city, with two currencies; and in its Western sectors there are larged armed forces from the West. The West, including Adenauer, announce *ad nauseam* their firm intention to maintain this position, and to block every attempt at a general settlement rather than accept any compromise; and they make the whole position a little more insane and dangerous by refusing to recognise the German Democratic Republic and by insisting on regarding the German Federal Republic as the only government of all Germany. Well now, since they ought not to be there, and have nothing to do there, why do they insist on staying? Partly, it is 'face', since Berlin is or was the capital of Germany; much more, it is a desire to make the maximum of a nuisance of themselves; and even more, they want a 'bridge-head' (they call it that themselves) from which among other things they can do espionage and other subversive work in the German Democratic Republic. And Adenauer is even worse than his allies and supporters; he refuses even to receive any kind of communication from the German Democratic Republic, and proclaims that he seeks no agreed reunification of Germany, but that he will 'liberate' the East (which he always calls the 'Soviet occupation Zone'. 'German Democratic Republic', for him, is a 'dirty word' like 'peace'). I must add one serious warning, that many responsible people in the German Democratic Republic believe that Adenauer is plotting a sudden invasion of East Germany by armed force, to 'liberate' it—which would almost certainly produce a Third World War. You won't believe that; and I am not sure that I do, yet; but we may be wrong, and I ought to tell you two things: firstly, that Adenauer's speeches are almost as bad as Hitler's, and are in some ways more openly aggressive (he has never said that any of his demands is the last he will make); and, secondly, that whilst I have often been wrong in my judgments, the only occasions on which I have *always* been wrong are those on which I have said of a capitalist government that I really didn't think it was quite as fiendish as had been suggested.

I would like to wind up by telling you something of the now growing prosperity of the German Democratic Republic, and of the instability of the German Federal Republic, so superficially prosperous on the basis of very heavy investments and subsidies from the U.S.A., but I have written too much already.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PENTAGON WRECKS THE SUMMIT

'Quaestor'

MACHIAVELLI, the sixteenth century Italian politician, had a word for it in *The Prince*, his book of advice to the young tyrant of Florence (Chapter 18): 'A prudent ruler ought not to keep faith when by so doing it would be against his interest. . . .' One may be sure that the handful of rogues and hypocrites, in charge of United States policy, who wrecked the Summit meeting in Paris, have read Machiavelli in their youth. The only thing they left out of their calculations is that we are not in the age of warring feudal despots, nor yet of humbugging Gladstones and Lloyd Georges, Teddy Roosevelts and Woodrow Wilsons: 'the many' have ideas of their own nowadays, and great Socialist states to voice those ideas when the capitalist newspapers, radio and TV try and stifle them.

That is why, within a very few days of its happening, the 'Operation Wrecker' of Eisenhower and his gangsters, backed up publicly —however embarrassed they may feel in private—by the British and French Governments, has been revealed to the whole world as the most sordid, perfidious and brassfaced episode in the diplomatic history of modern times. Moreover even Machiavelli would have been hard put to it to find what the wreckers have gained thereby.

Consider the main stages of the operation.

On May 1 (of all days!) the Americans sent a U2 reconnaissance plane over the Soviet frontier with a marked-out route passing from one NATO base (Adana in Turkey, whence he had come on April 27) to a second NATO base (Peshawar in Pakistan) and then over Afghanistan and (photographing military objectives) over Soviet territory, roughly northwards along the border between Europe and Asia, to a third NATO base (Bodoe in Norway). The Soviet rocket forces brought it down flying at 65,000 feet near Sverdlovsk, in the Urals, 1,250 miles into their territory: and Khrushchov announced the fact on May 5, at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. After two days of gross and shameless lying by the U.S. authorities,* all explanations cooked up at a special meeting of the highest American authorities and swallowed whole, with much abuse of the Soviet Union, by the British millionaire press, Khrushchov re-

*Such as: it was a weather plane, it was only flying over Turkey, the pilot had signalled oxygen-mask trouble, he was probably unconscious when the plane went off course, etc., etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Metropolitan Police on Strike—1890

Scene outside Bow Street Pol

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on, July 6, 1890.

(for story see pages ii and iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vealed on May 7 that the pilot was alive and well. Moreover he had testified to all the facts, and all the equipment would be on show to the public in Moscow (the U2 was of extremely light material, it was later revealed, which had literally floated down after the rocket explosion had disintegrated the plane). Only then did Washington admit the facts.

The Summit had been dealt a heavy blow. This was not simply spying. Spying is a breach of the national laws of a country, and it is always treated as such, when a foreign national engages in it, whether he has gained admission in a different guise (usually the case) or has crossed the frontier illegally. But the sending of a plane over the frontier by foreign government institutions (in this case the U.S.A. Central Intelligence Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, whose co-operation was later admitted) is a breach of international law. It is a violation of the obligation of all nations (recorded in the United Nations Charter as, before the Second World War, it was in the League of Nations Covenant) to respect one another's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It is an act of aggression, equivalent to piracy at sea. Thus it was a flagrant breach of the pledges of September, 1959, and of the assumptions of mutual good will on which the Summit meeting was to open on May 16. But this was not all.

On May 7, in admitting the facts, the State Department in Washington tried to justify 'the *necessity* for such activities'. This startled even the British capitalist press. The statement meant, wrote *The Times* Washington correspondent (May 9), that America was 'claiming the tacit right to recommence flights over Russia'. The *Daily Herald* editorial asked: 'Who wants to wreck the Summit Conference before it starts?' *The Guardian* editorial said it was 'imperative that the President should make clear he hasn't changed his policy'. He did nothing of the kind.

On May 9 Secretary of State Herter instead made clear to a meeting of Congressmen that 'America would continue with these flights', because Soviet secrecy was 'unacceptable' (*Daily Express*, May 10). The U.S.A. would go on taking 'such measures as are possible unilaterally', said Herter, nor was there any different conclusion in the other British press about Herter's statement. 'The clear suggestion was that these operations would continue,' wrote *The Times* Washington correspondent, the same day. Washington officials' 'new line is that the U.S. will continue its espionage', reported *The Guardian's* correspondent in the same city; and its editorial the next day protested that 'having once been caught red-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handed, the Americans cannot really persist in an illegal course'.

Oh yes they could, President Eisenhower himself gave the world to understand that very day (May 11). At his press conference he stated that secrecy and suspicion in the Soviet Union 'made intelligence operations by other countries *essential* . . . a vital *necessity*'. And once again there was no doubt in any country that he was referring, not to ordinary espionage, but to air violations of the Soviet frontier.

> His evident concern was to give full support to the case marshalled by the State Department in justification of American intelligence flights.
> (*The Times*, May 12, 1960.)

Scores of other newspapers agreed. This, moreover, was borne out by an American Note the same day replying to a Soviet protest of May 10. It referred specifically to the State Department's statement of May 9: it agreed that it had pursued such a policy up to now (of course, 'for purely defensive purposes'): *and it conspicuously avoided giving any pledge for the future.*

Thus the United States Government was coming to the Summit meeting armed with the arrogant pretension to violate international law and fly over Soviet frontiers at its own will and pleasure. It had done so, it said, and would continue doing so. It was the householder's fault for not opening his door, said the burglar. Moreover, this was being done (it was claimed) on behalf of the 'free world', *i.e.*, of NATO: and the use of NATO bases certainly seemed to justify the claim. Thus, all at once, the U.S.S.R. was confronted with an ultimatum. You will accept the claim that you are subject to the imposed will of NATO and its American overlord, by sitting down at table with him and discussing other questions, as though nothing has happened—and in that case prepare to have other requirements imposed upon you, because you have accepted a subordinate position in the world. Or you can refuse—and be charged with 'wrecking the Summit'. Instead of the Paris meeting taking place in an atmosphere of relaxed tension, international crisis or humiliation of the U.S.S.R. was the American aim.

The Soviet Government did its utmost to leave open the door for a more conciliatory way out. In his speech on May 5, Khrushchov asked whether 'this act of aggression was committed by the Pentagon militarists without the President's knowledge?' On May 7 he said: 'I am quite willing to grant that the President knew nothing about the plane'. On May 11, at the exhibition of the U2 equipment, he told the foreign press that Herter's statement had 'made us doubt the correctness of our earlier conclusions that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President did not know about the flights' and that his 'hopes have been somewhat disappointed' about Eisenhower. But he still treated the President's projected visit to the U.S.S.R. as possible, said he would talk over the question in Paris, and intimated that he himself would get there on May 14, two days before the opening of the Summit meeting—a clear hint that the door was still open for conciliation. Even in Paris, interviewed on May 15, by Macmillan, Khrushchov said he was willing to meet Eisenhower privately, if the latter was interested in a meeting. (Herter later deliberately misled the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this question, stating that Khrushchov had not wanted to meet the President.)

From beginning to end, however, Eisenhower did not take advantage of any of these opportunities. Right up to the opening of the Summit meeting on Monday, May 16, he let it be understood that the U.S. Government stood by its truculent and illegal claim. Many days later, some of the servile, bootlicking pro-American papers in London asserted that on May 15 there had been a 'leak' to the press in Paris that Eisenhower had stopped the flights; or that he had 'given assurances' that the flights would stop. But this lie can easily be run to earth—by looking up the British press next morning. *The Guardian* and *Telegraph* correspondents (May 16) did not even mention the leak; *The Times* reported that no decision had been taken to continue or discontinue the flights; the *Daily Express* correspondent said that 'Eisenhower does not intend to give any promise that U.S. intelligence flights over Russia will be stopped'.

Moreover, for good measure, Vice-President Nixon in a television interview on Sunday night, May 15, reiterated that the flights 'were made necessary by Russian secrecy and the danger of surprise attack' adding that 'he would continue spy flights if he was elected President' (*Daily Telegraph* and *Daily Herald*, May 17). At the same time Defence Secretary Gates ordered a defence alert of U.S. forces throughout the world on learning that Khrushchov next day would ask Eisenhower for an apology and punishment of those responsible for the U2 flights—and 'President Eisenhower concurred in the decision' (*Daily Telegraph* and *Guardian*, June 3). Gates admitted that he had not expected a surprise attack by Russia but had thought the atmosphere in Paris 'not very constructive' (*The Times*, June 3).

The result was a foregone conclusion. Khrushchov told the other leaders, when they met on the Monday morning, that the U.S.S.R.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would not put up with this treatment. The repeated and authoritative declarations of American policy doomed the Summit meeting 'to complete failure in advance'. The Soviet Government could not take part in talks 'in which one of the parties bases its policy with regard to the Soviet Union on treachery'—this would mean deceiving the peoples; nor could Eisenhower's projected visit to the U.S.S.R. in such conditions meet with 'proper cordiality'. The Soviet people cannot be hypocritical, and do not want to be, said Khrushchov. Both Summit and visit had better be postponed—unless the President were prepared to (i) renounce air violations of the Soviet frontier (ii) express his regret (iii) punish those 'directly responsible'. But if the flights continued, the planes would be shot down, and retaliatory action would be taken against the bases (in neighbouring countries) from which they took off.

Only at that point did Eisenhower assert that he had suspended the flights, which were 'not to be resumed'. But he also denied that the United States had ever threatened to continue them and went on talking about 'the *necessity* for all forms of espionage, *including overflights*'. Above all, Eisenhower refused to give a clear and categorical guarantee not to resume them, or express regret, or promise to punish the guilty. This, of course, meant that the practice itself is not repudiated, only postponed.

The word 'assert' was used advisedly just now. The British public has not been informed of the categorical statements of Drew Pearson, based on official information, in the *Washington Post and Times-Herald,* which throw a lurid light on Eisenhower's evasive speech. The Pentagon began to search for the order to suspend U2 flights which Eisenhower said he had given Gates and General Twining—and could not find it. Moreover, neither could recall any such order. Then the President said he had given the order verbally, *before* the U2 was shot down. They could not remember any such verbal order either. So the President explained he had given the order at a meeting of the National Security Council: found nothing in the minutes. Nor could any record be found of the alleged order given on May 12!

After all the lying and doubledealing in Washington before the Summit, who can guarantee that, as Pearson wrote, lying did not continue in Paris? And in fact in a letter to General Franco, Eisenhower once again asserted that the U2 flight was 'one phase of an intelligence system *made necessary* for defence against surprise attack' (*The Times,* May 23). Senator Lodge, U.S. representative at the Security Council, said that if only the U.S.S.R.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would accept Eisenhower's proposed treaty, this 'would end the *need* for spy flights' (*The Times*, May 24). Eisenhower repeated his defence of the principle of such flights in a television talk on May 25, adding that in any case the usefulness of the U2 had now been 'impaired': and Herter said the same in evidence to the Senate Committee on May 27. The Defence Correspondent of *The Guardian* was therefore fully justified in his comment (June 1) that these statements 'may possibly be interpreted in future as a reference only to the U2s which must soon be regarded as obsolete for the purpose'.

For the moment considerations of logic and facts fell into the background, however. Taking their cue from Eisenhower's reply to Khrushchov, and particularly his assertion that the latter was 'determined to wreck the Conference', the British and American press began a howling campaign of abuse of Khrushchov and the Soviet Government, with a parallel whitewashing of Eisenhower as a model of dignity, injured virtue, almost of Christian martyrdom.

No absurdity was too great for the servile capitalist newspapers to swallow. It was 'a great concession' (wrote the *News Chronicle* on May 17) that Eisenhower had promised to 'stop the flights for good' (which he had not): it was 'a generous gesture', a 'large concession', and so forth. The depths of impudence were plumbed by papers like the *Daily Telegraph*, which announced that Eisenhower had 'been the victim of unprecedented provocation' by a 'brutal Russian performance' (May 18): the *Daily Herald*, which announced that Khrushchov has 'tried to bully us' and held up Tory spokesmen like the Australian Menzies and Macmillan as examples of the British people (May 19); and the *Observer* (May 22) whose ineffable Soviet 'expert' wrote of Khrushchov 'seeking to brazen it out'. With one accord they—and the Tory, Labour and Liberal leaders in Parliament on May 20—accepted Eisenhower's declaration that the U.S.A. could never accept Khrushchov's terms for starting the talks: and all the dictionaries were searched for adjectives like 'insulting', 'humiliating', 'grovelling' (the revolutionary *Tribune* contributed this one, on May 20) to apply to those terms.

Yet as early as May 8 Harold Stassen, former defence adviser to Eisenhower, had said that the U2 had been deliberately sent 'by military officers' to upset the Summit, and called on the President to sack them 'no matter how high up they be' (*Daily Herald*, May 9—which by the way denounced them furiously). What had changed—except that Eisenhower had himself accepted responsi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bility? He was asked, in that case, to give a public apology. Has no head of government ever apologised? Senator Kennedy—possible Democratic candidate for President—did not think so.

> I certainly would express regret at the timing and give assurances that it would not happen again. I would express regret that the flight did take place. (*The Guardian*, May 19.)

What was there grovelling about that? But the London press—ever responsive to the fervent wish of the British ruling class to keep the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. as far apart as possible—would have none of it. There might have been some 'blundering', or 'foolishness', or 'hamhandedness' by the Americans, it conceded: but apologise to the Russians? Never! And the chorus of denunciation would begin again, varied with speculations about 'why Khrushchov did it'—one more fatuous than another, but all designed to throw the British public off the scent.*

What was the purpose of all these red herrings—and of still more nonsensical stories of mysterious Soviet trawlers 'spying' on NATO manœuvres in the Mediterranean, or elsewhere, *on the high seas* (as though the latter, too, belonged to the U.S.A.)?

It was first to distract attention from the lie which all the capitalist press for a time sought to maintain; that, unlike Britain where Macmillan, Gaitskell and Grimond were touchingly united in backing Eisenhower, the U.S.A. was behind him too. Yet almost at once the truth began to break through: that there was a deep split between the Republicans and the Democrats, and that while some of the orthodox Democratic *leaders* later took fright, this was more than made up by the great *rank and file* rally in support of Kennedy's and Adlai Stevenson's criticism, and by the ferment in the Republicans' own ranks, demonstrated by letters from readers printed in their newspapers all over the country. There are many millions of Americans today who know from bitter political experience the method of the stool-pigeon, the hired liar, the gunman and the screaming headline used by their rulers to procure criminal ends. They have put two and two together. That is why the world had the peculiar and shameful spectacle, during the second half of May and the first weeks of June, of the British public being still drenched with falsehoods about the Paris meeting, scarcely able to take breath and notice that there was another side to the Fleet Street story; while the public in the United States was

*None was so ludicrous as that dragged in by *The Times*, which on May 18 printed a letter (three-quarters of a column in close type) explaining that it was all due to Pavlovian psychological theories which the Russians were putting into practice. Abundant correspondence followed on the subject, lasting nearly a week, and effectively crowding out most of the more pointed letters closer to the subject.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being offered both facts to illustrate that side, and examples of sharp criticism of Eisenhower and of those who use him as their Charlie McCarthy.

It is important to notice, too, that other countries not so accessible to Fleet Street propaganda have not fallen victims to it. There is the case of Afghanistan, and of those caught out as accomplices, willing or unwilling, of their NATO partner: Turkey, Pakistan, Norway. They have sought and obtained positive assurances from the U.S.A. that it will play no more tricks with them, using their territory as stationary aircraft carriers. There are the Arab countries of the Near East, where *The Guardian* itself informs us (May 20) that the 'balance of opinion' is against Eisenhower. There are the smaller States in the United Nations, who found it necessary (even after Eisenhower's assurances which so satisfied the British press) to suggest to the American delegate Lodge 'that he should announce that reconnaissance flights over Russia are not United States Government policy' (*Daily Telegraph*, May 23). And there was the plain statement of Nehru at the All-India Congress Committee which made mincemeat of Eisenhower's protestations:

> The U-2 flight over Soviet territory was against international law, and the United States assertion that such flights would continue was a turning-point in the history of the summit conference that collapsed.
>
> (*The Times*, June 6.)

Why did the British capitalist politicians and capitalist press take up an anti-Soviet and a pro-Eisenhower attitude in defiance of the facts? There can be little doubt that it was because they saw that the revelations about the U2, and about American contempt for international law, were a damaging, perhaps decisive, blow at NATO, at the very time when Gaitskell and company were flourishing the 'threat' of NATO collapsing before the eyes of the trade union movement, in revolt against Britain being used by the U.S.A. as her expendable hydrogen-bomb base for attacking the Soviet Union. After all, the U2 would not have been where it was, or gone where it did, but for NATO bases. Thanks to evidence given to the U.S. Senate enquiry, the British public have learned what their government has refused to tell them—that, taking advantage of their presence as NATO forces here, the Americans have sent out the U2 from Lakenheath, in Suffolk (*The Guardian*, June 3). And in reply to Hugh Gaitskell's babble about Britain remaining in NATO, and supporting a NATO hydrogen bomb, under fifteen-nation control, the blunt and obvious answer was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given by the *Daily Telegraph*, which knows more of American policy than Gaitskell:

> At the moment the West's real deterrent resides in the American Strategic Air Force, which comes directly under Washington's control. Neither London nor Paris can decide when and where it should be used... Still less could it be supposed that NATO could ever use its deterrent without the agreement of the United States. If a NATO deterrent were to make any sense, therefore, it would in effect have to be an American deterrent. That is to say, its control would remain primarily in American hands, as is the case at present. (May 30, 1960.)

That is plain, brutal, militarist realism.

But the fogs are rolling away very quickly, for the mass of the working class in Britain, as elsewhere, has long begun to try and think for itself. The vulgar, as Machiavelli called them, are no longer 'always taken in by appearances'. Moreover, all the newspaper balderdash about a new turn in Soviet policy was blown sky-high, on June 3, by the new Soviet disarmament proposals, which took into account many of the Western governments' suggestions. It is a new reminder that there is a clear and positive alternative to NATO, with its accompaniment of American bullying bombast, and its ever-present threats of new U2s and new Pentagon provocations like those which wrecked the Paris Summit.

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

HARK WHO'S TALKING!

In politics honesty, I am afraid, is by no means always the best policy. But when a group of leaders surrender the most vital interests of their followers it does sometimes happen that they damage their own political careers also. And this seems to have happened in the case of the British Labour leaders' present surrender to the principles, general policy, and now the detailed plans, of the National Government.

(From *The Surrender of the Labour Party* by John Strachey, 1935.)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

OVERSEAS (post-free):

Second class mail (unsealed envelope)	
Canada and U.S.A.	$3.00
Elsewhere	£1
First class mail (sealed envelope)	
Canada	$3.50
Other Commonwealth countries	£1 4*s.* 0*d.*
U.S.A.	$4.50
Other non-Commonwealth countries	£1 12*s.* 0*d*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I'LL HAVE A CUP OF COFFEE!

Shirley Graham

ON the morning of March 9, citizens of Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A., opened their morning paper, *The Atlanta Journal*, and saw a full-page advertisement headed: *An Appeal for Human Rights*. Their startled eyes read:

> We, the students of the six affiliated institutions forming the Atlanta University Centre—Clark, Morehouse, Morris Brown and Spelman College, join our hearts, minds and bodies in the cause of gaining those rights which are inherently ours as members of the human race and as citizens of these United States.

There followed in boxed sections 'some outstanding examples of inequalities and injustices in Atlanta and Georgia'. The reader learned that 'many Negro children travel ten miles a day in order to reach a school that will admit them', that 'Negroes are denied employment in the majority of city, state and federal government jobs, except in the most menial capacities', 'whereas Atlanta provides some 4,000 beds' for its white people, it provides 430 beds for Negroes who constitute 32 per cent of the population, that if 'a Negro is hungry, his hunger must wait until he comes to a "colored" eating place, even his thirst must await its quenching at a "colored" water fountain'.

To say that the large majority of whites in Atlanta were aghast is putting it mildly. Furious telephone calls to *The Atlanta Journal* brought the defensive reply that the students had *bought* a page at regular advertising rates. And there is a clearly understood 'gentlemen's agreement' in American commercial circles that one may say *anything* in a paid advertisement. Governor Ernest Vandiver promptly declared the advertisement of 'foreign' origin, asserting that no student in Georgia, let alone 'nigra students' could have concocted such a document. The student protest movement, sparked in Greensboro, North Carolina, and blazing across state boundaries with the speed of a forest fire, gave the lie to two of the South's most cherished beliefs. The first is that the southern white, and he alone, 'understands' the Negro. The second holds that most Negroes advocate the practice that goes by the name of 'separate but equal'. It all started on the first day of February when four freshmen students from North Carolina's State College for Negroes entered a Woolworth's Store in Greensboro, quietly sat down at the lunch counter and each politely asked for 'a cup of coffee, please'. They sat there unserved for a couple of hours;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they would not have been served at any similar lunch counter throughout the South. On the next day the four returned accompanied by a crowd of students from the State College for Negroes. On the days that followed came more and more students from every Negro college and from every *white* college in the vicinity. The Negro and white students sat together at Woolworth's lunch counter and at other lunch counters. They sat quietly and politely asked for 'a cup of coffee, please', and the white students would not accept service unless the Negro students were served. So nobody was served. And the stores filled with curious and often angry people who could not believe their eyes. Policemen came and reporters and mobs of cursing gangsters. But still the students sat. Nobody else tried to get near the lunch counter though the stores were crowded from morning until night. Until finally the infuriated managers closed the lunch counters to everybody.

Violence erupted first in South Carolina and Virginia. Not from the students; they just came out in greater and greater numbers and sat at more and more lunch counters. The violence came from club-swinging law enforcement officers, store guards with German police dogs, and white ruffians shouting vile names and invectives, out to protect the 'lily-white womanhood of the South' with chains, baseball bats and stones. But the more students they hauled off in patrol wagons, the more seemed to appear. They came marching through the business district of former Confederate cities by the thousands, carrying banners with slogans protesting against discrimination and injustices which could no longer be endured. They gathered around monuments of Great Americans, sang the National Anthem and made speeches. Always they were orderly; always they acquitted themselves with dignity. On February 22 the *Richmond News-Leader* commented editorially:

> Many a Virginian must have felt a tinge of wry regret at the state of things as they are, in reading of Saturday's 'sit-down' by Negro students in Richmond stores. Here were the coloured students, in coats, white shirts, ties and one of them was reading Goethe and one was taking notes from a biology text. And here, on the side-walk outside, was a gang of white boys come to heckle, a ragtail rabble, slack-jawed, black-jacketed, grinning fit to kill, and some of them, God save the mark, were waving the proud and honoured flag of the Southern states in the last war fought by gentlemen. Eheu! It gives one pause.

Up north, Ernest Green, first Negro graduate of Little Rock Central High School, bearing a placard with the words: 'Woolworth's National Policy is Undemocratic', led the demonstration at Michigan State University where he is now a student. The speed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and determination with which students in the north organised in support of their Negro colleagues in the South seemed to indicate that these young people were only waiting for some such clear-cut issue. Overnight the students rose to their feet; they began raising funds to defend the southern students, calling protest mass meetings, picketing and boycotting chain-stores whose branches would not serve Negroes in the South. As an enthusiastic co-ed at the University of Wisconsin said to me, 'If Negro students can *sit down* in the South, surely we can *stand up* in the North'. Yet, the white ruling class of the *Deep* South, while deploring the 'impertinence' and 'antics' of 'spoiled upstarts' in border states and of 'communist-led riff-raff' in the North, affirmed confidently that they would have no trouble with their 'nigras'. *They* properly knew their place. And then the sit-downs started in Georgia and Negro students paid out good money to print such an 'advertisement'!

The Ku Klux Klan began terrorising Negro communities. A student in Texas was dragged from his home, beaten, branded with red-hot irons which left a KKK on his chest, and hung head down from a tree. A gang of whites armed with iron rods broke into another student's home in the middle of the night and beat his mother and sister.

In Louisiana, students of Southern University for Negroes began taking counsel one with another. This is the largest university for Negroes in the United States. Southerners point to its truly beautiful campus adorned with fine, live oaks and many large buildings as an example of what they are doing for their 'nigras'. The students come from small towns, farms and city ghettoes of that section of the United States where Negroes 'have no rights that white men are bound to respect'. They are frequently told how fortunate they are to be allowed to attend such a fine school. The campus is on the outskirts of Baton Rouge, capital of Louisiana and one of the chief petro-chemical centres in the country, with such giant enterprises as Esso Standard, United States Rubber, Kaiser Aluminium, Ethyl and Allied Chemical, employing more than 30,000 (mainly white) workers, most of them from Northern Mississippi, the toughest section of that state. To avoid trouble Negroes in Baton Rouge have long been exceedingly quiet and self-effacing. And, under the watchful eye of its well-dressed Negro president, Dr. Felton G. Clark, seldom does anything occur to ruffle the peaceful calm of Southern University's campus. Then, during the first week of March, the all-white, all-elective Louisiana State Board of Education issued a warning that any student joining

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in sit-down demonstrations would be subjected to 'stern disciplinary action'. A week after the Board's announcement the first group of students quietly sat down at a lunch counter. They were immediately arrested, charged with 'disturbing the peace' and bail was set for $1,500 each. On the campus 3,000 students staged a sympathy rally. They carried placards reading 'Here I Stand' and 'The Old Ways No More'. Negroes from Baton Rouge joined them and promised support. The next day when nine other students were arrested at two lunch counters, bails were posted for all by the Negro community. The eighteen students were released and returned to the University. That afternoon most of the college's 5,400 student body, carrying banners, marched silently through the centre of Baton Rouge to the State Capitol. Hundreds of Negroes crowded the sidewalks. They watched with apprehension but with growing pride as the young people filed by in orderly ranks, their heads lifted, their bright young faces determined and unafraid. They packed in front of the Capitol and recited the Lord's Prayer, sang the National Anthem. Then a senior from the University mounted the stairs and declared for all to hear: 'We want the rights given to us by God. . . . We want the right to move as we please, and not be hindered by tradition. . . . We do not seek to be the white man's brother-in-law, only his brother'. Perhaps the white people were too amazed to do anything! Nothing like this had ever happened in Baton Rouge! Unmolested the students climbed into buses and returned to the campus. The next day Dr. Clark suspended the eighteen students! Then the students began withdrawing from the school. Within two days nearly 4,000 filed withdrawal forms. School officials informed them that their forms would be stamped 'expelled for disorderly conduct'. Still they persisted. Finally it was announced that withdrawal forms would be given out only on the written request of parents. Students say that pressures were brought to bear on their parents. Remnants of classes were resumed. The eighteen will soon be tried in the Louisiana court of law. The Negro community has raised several thousand dollars for their defence. The story is not ended, but the 'peace' on Southern's campus is shattered.

The first 'shock tactics' of the student movement left a string of closed lunch counters throughout the south-east, across the southern portion of the nation into Texas and approximately fifteen hundred Negro students in jails, workhouses, on chain gangs or out on bail. Some merchants, after so many students had been arrested, assumed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that no more would dare appear and so opened their lunch counters. Immediately more Negro students 'sat down' until the lunch counters were closed again. This 'hit and run' tactic assured most of the lunch counters being closed most of the time. In San Antonio, Texas, several large merchants, faced with the threat of student sit-downs, announced, March 15, they were opening their counters to Negroes. Baltimore's largest department store admitted Negroes to its dining room on March 29. This was followed by the gradual but unannounced opening of all lunch counters and eating facilities in Baltimore to Negroes. The first negotiated agreement made with the Negro student leaders was in Nashville, Tennessee. After they 'tried out' allowing a certain number of Negroes to eat at a few lunch counters, the merchants of Nashville have begun a permanent and total desegregation of all eating places. Negro students of Fisk University, Meharry Medical College, and their co-working white students from Vanderbilt University made a long, hard struggle. There were massive arrests of students in Nashville, fights, near race riots. After six weeks of 'relay' sit-downs—as soon as one group was arrested, another took its place at the lunch counter—total disorganisation of studies interrupted by nights in rat-infested jails, broken heads, scarred bodies, work on chain gangs and in workhouses, the students were joined by the entire Negro community of the city. An early morning dynamite blast wrecked the home of one of the lawyers working on the students' defence. Other homes in the Negro community were damaged and more than a hundred windows blown out of the buildings of Meharry Medical College. In the week before Easter the Negro community began a massive 'withdrawal of patronage' campaign from the downtown district of Nashville. Merchants now acknowledge that this boycott was virtually 100 per cent effective. Since it is estimated that Negroes spend about $7,500,000 annually in the downtown store, it is clear that as the weeks passed and the boycott held, the necessities of business survival forced merchants to deal with the students on the integration issue. They held out only long enough to make the change cover *all* eating facilities.

Perhaps the four Carolina students who first 'sat down' in Greensboro, did not realise that in going into F. W. Woolworth they made the best possible choice of lunch counters. They may have started a chain reaction which may yet encircle the globe. For F. W. Woolworth Company almost does encircle the globe. It is the most extensive chain store in the world. When, therefore, by means of pickets, demonstrations and boycott it is brought to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the attention of the masses of people that a well-mannered Negro college student may not drink a cup of coffee in a Woolworth Store, people are shocked into an awareness of a situation they did not realise exists. And people are indignant! Philadelphia is only one example of cities where petitions have been circulated by youth groups recently and thousands of signatures secured; their 'Youth Against Segregation' petition read: 'We, the undersigned, pledge to buy nothing from an F. W. Woolworth Store anywhere until the management of the national chain stores orders all stores everywhere to serve and seat any customer without regard to race or color'. Members of the Presbytery of New York voted unanimously to have representatives of the Commission on Ecumenical Mission and Relations, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., attend a Woolworth stockholders' meeting, May 18, and 'move for a policy of nonsegregation'. The United Presbyterian Church holds $100,000 worth of common stock in the company. At the recent conference of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organisations, top union leaders pledged themselves to boycott chain stores that refused to serve Negroes at Southern lunch counters. *The Wall Street Journal,* March 14, 1960, reported: 'One Woolworth unit (Durham, North Carolina) that normally does about 50 per cent of its business with Negroes has been practically deserted in recent days'. The same report could be made now on Woolworth Stores in hundreds of communities. On a bright, sunny Saturday here in New York, pickets from the American Jewish Congress, led by its national president, the Rev. Joachim Prinz, practically emptied Woolworth's large Fifth Avenue store.

The Student Movement has goaded long-established adult organisations into unprecedented action. At the Conference of Southern Negro Student Leaders meeting April 15-16, in Raleigh, North Carolina, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was strongly criticised for its lack of militancy in fighting segregation. Its publication the *Crisis* was labelled a magazine of the 'black bourgeois club' falling far short of the ideals of its founder, W. E. B. Du Bois. Now, in addition to defending in court all of the hundreds of students who have been arrested, the N.A.A.C.P. has announced a 'Wade In Campaign' of the public beaches and parks, maintained by tax funds, along the thousand of miles shoreline from Cape May, New Jersey, to Brownsville, Texas. Negroes have been excluded from all these beaches.

Continued on page 330

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MODERN AMALGAMATION IN PROCESS

W. J. Michael

General Secretary of the Associated Blacksmiths' Forge and Smithy Workers' Society.

[*We are pleased to print this fraternal address to the Conference of the United Society of Boilermakers, Shipbuilders and Structural Workers, on May 25, 1960. It exemplifies a modern method being adopted to bring about trade union amalgamation—a process which in the earlier years of the century encountered so many set-backs and obstacles, not only those of a legal nature.—Ed.*, L.M.]

THIS occasion is of great importance to us for two reasons. Firstly, it takes place when relations between our two societies have reached 'welding heat', as we say in the smithy and forge. Secondly, it is I believe the first time that an official fraternal delegation from our Society has attended your Annual Conference.

As you no doubt are aware it was last November that the executives of our two societies met in Glasgow and framed a 7-point Declaration.* This document contained the basic structure upon which an amalgamation could be formed between us. For our part the struggle to achieve closer unity has been a long and painstaking one (to which I have no desire to bore you with a mass of historical data). It is timely to recall that amalgamation talks between us is not a recent phenomenon. As far back as 1917 our two societies participated in a form of amalgamation with the Shipwrights. Quite true it dissolved itself after a few years. But it was at least a good omen for the future.

Amalgamation of course is not just our private preserve. Many progressive-minded trade unionists have been witnessing over the years the employers banding together into more compact and powerful forms of organisation. In fact, these take-over bids that we hear about so much these days are just another indication of what is taking place. We therefore can hardly dispute that in a crisis the shipbuilding and engineering employers speak with one

*The Seven Points quoted by the Boilermakers' annual report were as follows: '1. That the name "Blacksmiths' " will be included in the title of the Society. 2. That a Blacksmiths' Section of the Society should be formed. 3. That the Blacksmiths' Section would have trade autonomy. 4. That the Blacksmiths' membership will be responsible for electing its own officials. 5. That the Blacksmiths' Executive would deal with trade matters only. 6. Financial matters to be dealt with by a General Executive on which two members of the Blacksmiths' Section shall be members. Representatives of the Blacksmiths' Section on a *pro rata* basis, shall be eligible to attend the Annual Delegate Conference of the Society, together with full-time officials. 7. Subject to the acceptance by the respective memberships of the above six points, the joint executives shall proceed with the amalgamation and draft a joint rule book.' The May Conference recommended these points to the membership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united voice and moreover can act with a speed that is amazing. We of course have our Confederation; but it is often too painfully obvious that sectional divisions do on occasions hamper its ability to act with power and speed.

Nonetheless, we believe the experience of the war years has done much to foster the compelling need of closer unity. The desire of all to defeat the common enemy created more fraternal relations between unions. The sweeping changes in production technique, particularly in the shipbuilding industry, applied a stress upon craft practices and has stimulated some profound thinking.

Small wonder, then, that even before the war had finished the Trades Union Congress was seriously considering trade union structure and unity. In 1945 they published a report on the subject; and in that report they considered it desirable that the boilermakers, blacksmiths and shipwrights should be consulted with regard to the question of amalgamation. They said that a good understanding existed amongst them and little or no evidence existed of inter-union competition. So despite the ill-informed attacks of many of those who are outside the industry—and some who are in it—we firmly maintain that the foregoing good relationship still exists today. At any rate, our Society has with the full backing of its membership patiently pursued the path of closer unity in the post-war years. During that period some attempts were made to achieve amalgamation amongst large groups of unions simultaneously. We participated in these events, which did much to keep the issue alive. Nevertheless, we strongly felt that the most practical course of an approach was along the line of direct contact between two unions of identical interests. We therefore submit with all due respect that this better course has proved the more fruitful.

Well, then, we have come a long way since talks first took place between us in 1951. The going has not just been entirely smooth. Differences and doubts have arisen; that we need not question. While it would be foolish to ignore them it would indeed be criminal to exaggerate them and ignore the obvious fact that the sum of our agreement far outweighs the decimal fraction of our divisions. As most of you are aware we have a section of semi-skilled members whose interests we have catered for since our foundation. We have always upheld the principle that whatever technical difference exists between the smith and his striker, as trade unionists they are brothers with hands firmly clasped across the anvil. We have assured these lads that whatever arena of amalgamation we may enter, we will cross the threshold side by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side; so we ask you to respect that tradition. Again, we have our demarcation differences with you. We are not so foolish as to believe that amalgamation is a magic wand that will cause all such difficulties and differences to disappear. After all, such wonders may occur in fairyland, but they certainly don't occur in dockland. The point is we expect you as lads who have ever been willing to fight for your rights and we in turn ask you to acknowledge that right to us also. At all events what we do believe is that the voluntary association of our two unions in friendly brotherhood will develop a fertile climate which can well remove unnecessary tension on such differences and provide the readily acceptable solution.

And so we come to stand together with dignity and mutual regard with much more in common than we have at variance. In that respect, Mr. President, it is our pleasure to inform you that we now have the powers to progress still further the links that unite us. I refer of course to the decision reached between the two executives at Glasgow in November last. For our part we have implemented that decision and in accordance with the expressed will of our membership as recorded by ballot vote* to our executive in Edinburgh last week, I have therefore to convey to you that this national vote of ours is a very substantial one in favour of lining up as a trade section within the Boilermakers' Society as the parent body.

So there, Mr. President, having clearly made known our position I end on this note. That while we were strong in separation, yet more strong can we become in unity. May this association which marks another step in our history flourish for the benefit of the members we both represent. And may it also serve as an example to those whose desire for a united trade union movement was firm and solid as our own.

*With no less than 60 per cent of the membership voting, the result was nearly nine in ten in favour of the amalgamation proposals.

Continued from page 327

A new day has dawned in America. Our youth is on the march. Diana Nash, a pretty Fisk University co-ed, after serving a sentence in the workhouse, says: 'When we started this thing, we had a strong purpose. But after we stood in a courthouse being tried for our freedom, our dedication doubled, trebled. The fight hasn't begun yet'!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIEWS OF THE WORLD

Rules Revision

The 42nd National Committee of the A.E.U. held in Blackpool continued as the Rules Revision Committee which is held every five years with two Australian delegates present. Outstanding features of this National Committee have already been noted by Vulcan in the June *Labour Monthly*. In addition to the wide gap between the platform and the floor, there also developed during the five-week period defections from the rigid right-wing policy which the Union leaders attempted to foist on all acquiescent delegates. This policy was responsible for the debacle on officials' salaries. For years in every possible way the right-wing has sought to undermine and restrict the democracy of the union. This gave rise to a number of sharp discussions during the meeting. The first battle took place immediately following Carron's vitriolic attack on the shop stewards. The Executive Council had disallowed about 40 resolutions for the Agenda despite the fact that according to rule such resolutions are subject to the approval of the District Committee and Divisional Committee only. For many years the National Committee by a majority vote accepted standing orders which endorsed this power taken upon themselves by Executive Council in violation of rule. The very fact that some of the resolutions concerned were sharply critical of Executive Council made this denial of democracy more obvious. This year the issue was battled out in a prolonged debate and the amendment to bring Standing Orders in line with rule received 24 votes to 28 against.

When the question of the salaries to be paid to full-time officials came to be discussed this also gave rise to a lengthy discussion. The tradition in the A.E.U. has been for salaries to be commensurate with wages in the industry. No union branch had proposed increases in the salaries of the full-time officials but the Executive, also having power to make suggestions, proposed a salary for the President of £1,500 and for the Divisional Organisers £1,000, thus increasing the differential to 50%. It is interesting to note that the spokesman for the District Officials, Brother Morrow, was opposed to increased differentials. The debate was opened on a general resolution that the salaries of all officials be increased, which was carried by 44 votes to 10. The salary of the President was then discussed. The proposal for £1,500 meant a £6 10s. a week increase, together with £100 personal allowance, £50 London allowance, delegation expenses and

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Bullards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing, Translating. (Private Lessons, Shorthand/Typing.) Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Lab. Mvt., Spain, Russia, Comintern. We collect. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. RIV 6807.

LEFT-WING BOOKS and pamphlets bought. High prices paid. Write: Michael Katanka, 160, Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middlesex.

PUBLICATIONS

NATIONAL GUARDIAN, New York, is the voice of progressive America. Edited by James Aronson. 35s. annually. Order from Collet's, 40, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

SHOW YOUR OVERSEAS FRIENDS the best in Britain! Send *Labour Monthly* this year. We'll post it for you anywhere in the world for £1 yearly, 10s. half-yearly; or 42s. by air. (U.S.A.: $3; 1st class mail, $4.50; airmail, $7.) Write: 'Subs', 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other unspecified perquisites. Four amendments were moved during the debate to reduce the £6 10s. increase but all were rejected. This left only the resolution standing for £6 10s., which when put to the vote was rejected by 24 votes in favour to 28 against. This result caused consternation. The left had made its position clear during the debate; it was prepared for a £2 a week increase. The responsibility rested with the supporters of 'all or nothing'. The following day the Committee proceeded to reject the proposed increase for all national officials by the same vote. The local officials however were only down for £120 a year increase and this received the support of those who were in favour of a similar increase for all officials and those who voted for the Executive's proposals. The anomalous position was thus created that the local officials received their increase while the national officials got nothing. No doubt members of the Executive debarred by rule from attending this meeting themselves, had a few unkind words for their President. The sequel followed later when the Standing Orders Committee recommended that the Executive be requested to recall the meeting after the normal closure in order to reconsider the position. The final outcome was that national officials also received the £120.

Much attention was displayed by the press in an Executive proposal that only members of the Labour Party should be allowed to pay the political levy, with the avowed aim of excluding Communists from political rights in the union. It had been the practice for all suggestions made by the Executive to be formally moved by a delegate so that the President could make an explanation on behalf of the Executive. On reaching this item the President paused hopefully. But the only response he received was 'not moved' and he had to proceed to the next item. A gain for democracy in the union was recorded when a rule made a few years ago to debar candidates from sending out handwritten material canvassing for support was rescinded. During recent years the press lords have used their influence on behalf of all candidates meeting with their approval and vilified those who do not. The alteration may go some way to redress the balance. A few comments on Australia where we have over 2,500 branches and 77,000 members need to be made. Conditions differ considerably from those in Britain. The reactionary Menzies Government in its efforts to combat and hamstring the unions has provided under certain conditions for court-controlled ballots for officials of the union. Under militant leadership high wages have been won. The General Rules provide for the Australian Rules to be amended to meet the requirements of labour legislation. The members in Australia, however, refuse to interpret this as an acceptance of the reactionary policy and legislation of the Menzies Government and battle against it by all means in their power. This has led to many sharp clashes between the Commonwealth Council and the Executive Council. It was therefore vital to the Australian membership that their delegates should attend not only statutory Rules Revision meetings but also all recalled meetings. An Executive proposal that they should only attend if considered necessary was lost. Approval was given for an additional Divisional Organiser for Tasmania. Other issues were debated keenly and led to narrow votes. The increase in contributions for all sections, *e.g.*, Section 1, 2s. 3d. per week to 3s., may

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provoke much criticism from the membership. However there can be no doubt that the proceedings as a whole represent a gain for progress and democracy.

A DELEGATE.

BOOKS

Studies in the History of Education
Brian Simon
Lawrence & Wishart, 376pp. 37s. 6d.

HAVE you ever wondered why the ruling class has been unable to solve the problem of educational advance which is as vital to them as it is to the nation as a whole? Why it is that it allows other countries to outstrip us in science and technology?

Here in this book is part of the answer. It is a clearly written and carefully documented account of the slow and painful emergence of a universal system of education (still sadly incomplete) between 1780 and 1870. At the beginning of the 19th century pressure for the reform of the predominantly feudal and clerical institutions — the Public Schools, the decaying Grammar Schools, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—came both from the rising class of industrialists and the professional middle-class associated with them and from the working-class under the leadership of the Chartists. After a period of suppression following the French Revolution these groups of radicals met with certain success with the founding of University College, London, in 1826, the establishment of a number of schools with a progressive method and content, including University College School (1828), the Liverpool Institute, and others in Leicester and elsewhere. These catered mainly for the middle-class and may be said to have begun the teaching of science in schools. During the same period Owenite Halls of Science and Mechanics' Institutes to some extent met the needs of the artisans. These movements generally moving on a parallel course but sometimes working together are connected with such famous names as Watt and Boulton of the Soho Steel Works, of Wedgwood the potter, of Erasmus Darwin grandfather of Charles Darwin, and Joseph Priestley the discoverer of oxygen, as well as of the leading Chartists and Robert Owen, who worked out and popularised the idea of a national system of education. But throughout the period progress was slow and painful, ignored by the ancient universities, hindered and even suppressed by the establishment of the time.

It was not until 1870 that the beginnings of a national system of education was established—more than 50 years later than in France! The struggle for popular education is indissolubly connected with the struggle of the classes for power. There can be no general or fundamental educational advance without a preceding shift in political power. There is also a second conclusion that emerges from the abundant material (much of it the fruits of original research) collected by the author. It is that the struggle for popular education is a vital sector in the wider class struggle. As the author says in the introductory chapter: 'It is primarily in the working-class movement that there is expressed the fervent belief in the power of the human reason, in science, in education as an essential means to individual and social development'.

This book is an admirable example of the application of Marxism to a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particular sphere of social life. Its value is greatly enhanced by the clarity and simplicity of the style.

G. C. T. GILES.

Kiev Rus
B. D. Grekov

Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.
18s. 688pp.

FOR more than two centuries—from before 900 till about 1100 A.D.—most of European Russia was united under a powerful feudal state, with its capital at Kiev. From the early twelfth century the same causes which in the west had led to the disintegration of the empire of Charlemagne gradually reduced the Russian state, in spite of the efforts of such rulers as Vladimir Monomakh, to a loose federation of independent and often mutually hostile principalities and republics. When in the thirteenth century the Mongols swept over Russia, there was no concerted resistance to them; indeed, many of the princes and dignitaries capitulated without a fight in order to retain their feudal privileges. Kiev itself was sacked in 1240, its famed churches and palaces largely destroyed, and many thousands of its citizens massacred or led off to slavery. The Kiev state in its heyday was one of the great powers of the mediaeval world, and the history of the period can only be distorted by failure to take account of it. Its trade connections ran from Norway to Baghdad, from France to Bokhara, and the force of its arms was felt from Sweden to Asia Minor. The network of marriages between the Princes of Kiev and the ruling houses of Europe symbolises the political status of the country. To glance only at Anglo-Russian relations, the sons of King Edmund Ironside, driven from England by Canute, sought refuge in Kiev; among those they met there would be Prince Yaroslav's son-in-law, the Norwegian Harald Hardrada, who was to meet his death at Stamford Bridge in 1066. And Prince Vladimir Monomakh—himself the grandson of a Byzantine emperor, brother-in-law of a German emperor, and father-in-law of a king of Hungary—married a daughter of King Harold of England, driven from her native land by the Norman conquest; their son, Prince Yuri Dolgoruky ('Longarm'), was the founder of Moscow, destined to be the centre of the new Russian state arising upon the ruins of Kiev Rus.

Academician Grekov's book, now available in English after appearing in a number of editions in the Soviet Union in the last fifteen years, was designed primarily as a handbook for school teachers. It presumes a general acquaintance with the course of events, and concentrates on polemical discussion of the most controversial issues. In doing so Grekov has to fight on two fronts: on the one hand against the Normannists, who supposed the Kiev state to be an artificial creation, imposed by a ruling class of Scandinavian invaders on the passive and feckless Slavs, and on the other hand against the tribalists, who believed that Russian society in the Kiev period was not a class society at all, and that the social and political development of Russia was unique. Stated baldly, neither of these theses seems very plausible. Yet they were worked out in great detail by historians of distinction, and strong traces of both, and particularly of the second, are still to be found in popular ideas on the Kiev state. Grekov, dealing particularly with agrarian relations and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the economic history of the towns, shows how the Kiev state arose naturally out of the decaying tribal society—which had already thrown up a powerful but short-lived state in this region—how more and more of the people fell into various forms of bondage to the great landlords, how labour rent tended to be replaced by rent in kind and then by money-rent, how the growing efficiency of the parts—measured in feudal terms—made the local rulers less and less willing to maintain the central apparatus. For those who have some acquaintance with the Middle Ages it is fascinating reading just because of the combination of new material and familiar patterns. A little more imagination on the part of the editor and publishers would have made the book much more readable by the non-specialist. For instance, the Russian terms of feudal land-tenure and social stratification are unfamiliar, and the reader is soon lost in a jungle of *smerds* and *kholops*, *volosts* and *vervs*. These terms are all in due course discussed, and their changing meaning over the centuries elucidated. But why not provide a glossary of rough and ready definitions, such as a Russian reader brings with him from his school-days? Again, though every page is studded with place-names, there are no maps; few English readers know where to look for Tmutarakan or Pereyaslavl, and few English maps are of much help. The Russian reader, too, knows roughly the order and date of the main events of his own history, and the identity of the leading figures. Could chronological and genealogical tables not have been provided for the foreign reader? And why is there no index? A history book cannot be translated as if it were a book on physics or mathematics. There is always an unfamiliar frame of reference to be supplied.

The translation is accurate and idiomatic, with only here and there a proper name in a strange form, e.g. *Horvatia* for *Croatia*, *Amalikityans* for *Amalekites*.

ROBERT BROWNING.

F. M. Dostoyevsky
V. Yermilov
Central Books. 294pp. 6s.

FYODOR Dostoyevsky was born in 1821 at a time when Tsarist Russia was the pillar of reaction in Europe. He grew to manhood at a time when the new capitalist order, victorious in Britain and France, was hammering at established feudalism in Central and Eastern Europe, and when Russian intellectuals were listening to the revolutionary message. Tsarist officialdom was frightened. In 1849 Dostoyevsky and a score of others who had been talking revolution (it was little more than talk) were arrested, condemned to death, reprieved as they faced the firing squad and exiled to Siberia.

It broke his spirit. He had never been deep in the revolutionary movement. As for Socialism, the only kind he knew was the utopian brand of Fourier, as interpreted to Russian intellectuals by Petrashevsky. He never read Marx or any Marxist. The shock of his exile reduced him to a despair of humanity that never left him. It shows in his face, which becomes more and more dejected in each succeeding photograph. And it shows in his work.

To Dostoyevsky man is a miserable being groaning under the rule of hangmen, and what is worse, every man would be a hangman if he could. After recall from exile he travelled in western Europe and had a close-up view of the capitalism that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had stepped into the shoes of feudalism. It horrified him, as it horrified many others. But his horror was not illumined by any scientific theory of social evolution, and drove him (as it drove others similarly unillumined —one thinks of Carlyle in his later years) into violent reaction and vicious racialism.

Yet Dostoyevsky's notes on the capitalist West are shrewd. Particularly so is his picture of London in 1863, with its 'foul Thames' and 'coal-steeped air', its 'splendid parks, gardens and squares' for the rich, its 'frightful' Whitechapel, its 'hungry, savage and ill-clad' East-Enders, and its child-prostitution—not yet exposed by Stead in his *Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon*. But whereas Marx saw all this and pointed the way out through working-class struggle, Dostoyevsky saw it and could only shriek despair.

In his novels, *Crime and Punishment, The Possessed, the Hobbledehoy*, and *The Karamazov Brothers*, Dostoyevsky works out his melancholy theory of a world composed of jackboots and doormats. His criminals justify themselves by pointing out, truly enough, that successful capitalists and brass-hats are no better than they are. As capitalism will be no improvement on Tsarism, revolution is simply not worth while. What's the good of anything? Why nothing!

In the end he needs religion to deaden him to the stink of it. The trouble is that Dostoyevsky is too intelligent really to believe in religion. Even suppose we put down human suffering to sin, what about the suffering of children? Dostoyevsky gives up the question, or solves it with the unreal reply (put in the mouth of a priest) that we do not know everything, and that in another world we shall see that it is all right.

It says much for the broad-mindedness of the Soviet Government that they should think Dostoyevsky, with his 'black pessimism' and 'cult of suffering', worth commemorating. As Yermilov says at the end, Dostoyevsky was right to recoil in horror from capitalism, but wrong in lacking the will to struggle against it. He drew its ugly portrait, and left others to punch it on the nose.

ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Key Questions for Trade Unionists. Jim Gardner. Lawrence & Wishart. 72 pp. 2s. 6d.
Paved with Gold. Dave Wallis. Heinemann. 242 pp. 16s.
Let Us Live in Peace and Friendship. N. S. Khrushchov. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 406 pp. 9s.
Andromeda: A Space-Age Tale. Ivan Yefremov. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 444 pp. 10s. 6d.
Nationalisation. H. Fagan. Lawrence & Wishart. 64 pp. 2s. 6d.
Haldane of Cloan. Dudley Sommer. George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 448 pp. 42s.
An Essay on Economic Growth and Planning. Maurice Dobb. Routledge & Kegan Paul. 120 pp. 15s.
Dancing to Fame. M. Chudnovsky. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 100 pp. 5s.
Prokofiev. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 334 pp. 21s.
Russian Decorative Folk Art. M. Ilyin. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 136 pp. 18s.
Durov and his Performing Animals. E. Dvinsky. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 128 pp. 3s. 6d.
The Origin of Man. M. Nesturkh. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, and Central Books Ltd. 350 pp. 30s.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

carriage windows were shivered into fragments; and his Royal Highness Edward Guelph who was at the opera got away as quietly as he could'.

Commonweal of June 12 (after the 'revolt' had been crushed and another 12 rebels dismissed) contains the text of the circular, which whatever else the signatory of it may have done before or after, singles him out for historic mention. 'Metropolitan Police, Bow Street, July 4, 1890. Dear Sir,—Please make known to your men that Mr. Matthews last night said: "The police have a perfect right to petition". Also ask your sub-divisions to do likewise; it is for their mutual benefit, and the betterment of the whole force. This petition has gone in from Bow Street, and has met our respected Commissioner's approval. For further particulars etc., apply to your obedient servant, Thos. Beevers, P.C. 134E'.

Surely it is somewhat of a rarity to see workers demonstrating in support of policemen on strike? Yet that is what the contemporary picture in this issue recalls so vividly from a long-forgotten incident of seventy years ago. It is unfortunately rather more usual to see police in violent action against strikers: printers will well remember the events of exactly a year ago. Each generation gets lessons in the meaning of The State, how it works and on whose behalf. During the apprentices' strike there were cases of outrageous police behaviour, which have not yet received the publicity they deserve. It was not merely unjustified arrests, but totally illegal and underhand practices, including finger-printing. But when a spirited lad feels he is speaking up not only for himself but for 50,000 like him, all united, determined and in the right, it takes more than an unholy alliance of State and employers to intimidate him. Certainly the fighting qualities young people have shown in Britain (not to mention Japan and Africa) have earned them respect from their elders. That has been evident at trade union conference after conference, as I have had on several occasions this past month to see for myself, thanks to readers' support for the Out-With-The-Manager Fund. Equally I have been impressed by the high regard for L.M. which conference delegates have shown, and by what new readers have been saying and writing. It only goes to show what opportunities are waiting to be seized.

As to the fund, I can only say that what is needed now is more *group collections* to match the generosity of individual gifts. May totalled:

£50 12s. 5d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: J. Austin Smith, 6s; H.G.B., 4s; W.B.S., 'Ayr', 10s; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; M. Philibert, 10s; C.T.H., £4; H. Brindle, 5s; M. Brandt, 2s 6d; S. Mill, £1; E. Strachan Rogers, £1 1s; R. McLeod, 2s 6d; R.F.B., £3; M. Illing, 10s; C.T.M., 9s; C.T.M. (Penny in the £), 13s 2d; Oliver Twist and Friends, 10s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s; L. Perkins, 5s; T.W.R., £1; Blackburn branch, 2s; Oldham branch, 1s; In Memory of Joe Brien, 3s; 'L'Humanité', 4s; S. Morrissy, 10s; The Humphreys Family, 5s; B. Ainley, 10s; E.J.B., 10s; Socialist Sailor, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.
OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: F. H. Oldaker, £1; G. M. Driver, £1 2s; Collection at Aldermaston, 6s 6d; Collection at Blackpool, 5s 6d; Blackburn Readers' Social, £1 7s; W. J. Glennie, 10s; Co-op. Divi., £1 11s 4d; H. R. Davies, 5s; J. H. Wood, 4s; P. Montebello, 2s; J. McKinnon, £1; H. Apps, 10s; J. Dunn, 2s; C. G. Roberts, 7s 6d; J. E. Hilton, 2s; W. C. Byatt, 11s 6d; R. Herring, 2s 6d; A. W. Elliott, 3s 6d; D. M. Lang, 12s; S. K. Biswas, 10s; F. J. Jones, 10s; E. Williams, 12s; T. Aldred, 2s 6d; F. and F.B., 6s; F. Browne, 2s; J. G. Barker, 2s; H. Woodfield, 10s; R. N. Milton, £1 12s; D. Mukerji, £1 5s; F.G.A., 10s; J. McLanachan, 12s; Anon, 2s 6d; F. M. Roy, 2s; K.J.A. (Canada), 7s 3d; A.C.H. (U.S.A.), 14s 2d.
OUT-WITH-THE-MANAGER FUND: H. S. Richards, £10; C.T.H., £4.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482

ANGELA TUCKETT
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide ranges of furs, stoles, cape-stoles, collars, coats, etc.
Full credit facilities

Mention LM for 5% discount

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey

Phone CROydon 4328

Lytton Bros. Ltd.

We stock top quality men's wear at reasonable prices.

Call when in town, mentioning Labour Monthly.

11 Marchmont Street, London, W.C.1

TERminus 4058

by Russell Square Tube Station

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

LABOUR RESEARCH

Hours and Holidays
Primary School Scandal
price 1s. 2d. post free

Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C. 2

Invisible Spectacles

For particulars of

CONTACT & MICRO-CORNEAL LENSES

Write, phone or call at

8 Archway Road, Highgate, N.19.
(Opposite Archway Underground)

Phone : ARChway 1506

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the.....issue

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED